


No. *53* —

LIBRARY

OF THE

Representative Meeting.

 Books **Not** to be taken out of the Meeting
House.

UNIVERSITY
OF PITTSBURGH
LIBRARIES



DAR. RM.
BX7617
B5D3
1805
c. 1

THIS BOOK PRESENTED BY
Friends'
Historical Society of
Swarthmore College

House.

to be taken out of the Meeting









A
D E F E N C E
OF THE
CHRISTIAN DOCTRINES
OF THE
Society of Friends,
AGAINST THE CHARGE OF SOCINIANISM;
AND ITS
CHURCH DISCIPLINE VINDICATED,

In Answer to a Writer who styles himself Verax :

In the course of which the principal Doctrines of Christianity are set
forth, and some objections obviated.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

A LETTER TO JOHN EVANS,

The Author of ' A Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World,'

And Strictures on the Eighth and Ninth Editions of that Work.

By JOHN BEVANS, Jun.

' It was needful to me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly
' contend for the Faith which was once delivered unto the saints.'

JUDE, ver. 3.

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by *Phillips & Fardon*, George Yard, Lombard Street;
and Sold also by *J. & A. Arch*, Cornhill;

J. Johnson, St. Paul's Church Yard; *Button & Son*, Paternoster Row
and *J. Hatchard*, Piccadilly.

1805.



CONTENTS.

PREFACE - - - - - Page v

INTRODUCTION, containing a brief account of the Church Discipline of the Society of FRIENDS - - - - - xiii

C H A P. I.

Remarks on the Seventh Edition of John Evans's Sketch, including a brief account of the Proceedings of the Society of FRIENDS against HANNAH BARNARD; in a Letter to the Author: together with some Strictures on the Eighth and Ninth Editions of his Work - - - - - I

C H A P. II.

Remarks on the state of the controversy—Of WILLIAM PENN's sentiments respecting the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ, and respecting the state of man in the Fall - 33

C H A P. III.

Of ROBERT BARCLAY's sentiments respecting the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and the state of man in the Fall.—Of GEORGE FOX's sentiments on the same subjects - - - 58

C H A P. IV.

Of ISAAC PENINGTON's sentiments respecting the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and the state of man in the Fall.—RICHARD CLARIDGE's Essay on the Doctrine of the Trinity. His Essay on the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction cleared from the misconstructions of VERAX - - - - - 73

C H A P. V.

ON THE SCRIPTURES.

Introductory Remarks.—RICHARD CLARIDGE's *Traſtatus Hierographicus; or a Treatiſe concerning the Holy Scriptures.*—ROBERT BARCLAY's belief in the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, illustrated by divers extracts from his Works.—Objections answered - - - - - 100

C H A P. VI.

A continuation of the ſame ſubject.—The belief of WILLIAM PENN and RICHARD MORRIS in the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, illustrated by divers extracts from their writings - - - - - 135

C H A P. VII.

The ſpecific Charges againſt HANNAH BARNARD, as they are ſeverally ſtated in the Appeal, examined; and the Objections to them answered.—On the Divine commands for the wars of the Jews - - - - - 160

C H A P. VIII

A continuation of the ſame ſubject.—On the Divine commands for the wars of the Jews.—On the Divine command to ABRAHAM to offer up his ſon ISAAC - - - - - 183

C H A P. IX.

A continuation of the ſame ſubject.—On the Miraculous Conception and Birth of Chriſt.—Of JOB SCOTT's ſentiments on the Divinity of Chriſt and the New Birth - - - 206

C H A P. X.

A continuation of the ſame ſubject.—On the Miracles of Chriſt.—Some objections to the late Proceedings of the Society of FRIENDS, in England, answered - - - 246

P R E F A C E.

THERE doth not exist a religious Society that has been more calumniated either ‘ through prejudice, ‘ passion, or interest,’* than that of the Friends, usually denominated Quakers. The most contradictory appellations have been given to them, without the least regard to truth, but as they best suited the designs of their adversaries; thus they have been, at different periods, represented as Papists, and Deists, Jesuits, and Socinians, Anabaptists, Ranters, Fanatics, Enthusiasts, Blasphemers. And now the old charge of Socinianism, under the new name of Unitarianism, is revived against our first Friends; and an abdication of their primitive Christian principles, and intolerance towards those who advocate such principles, are the accusations preferred against their successors; because they firmly resist all attempts to impose upon the Society such unsound doctrine for genuine Christianity.

The following pages are designed to defend our Society from these new charges and calumnies, that have been circulated respecting its Christian principles, and conduct, in a case that came before the yearly meeting of 1801; in certain publications, viz. 1st. ‘ An Appeal to

* Evans’s Preface to his Sketch, 8th Edit. p. v.

‘ the Society of Friends, on the primitive Simplicity of
 ‘ their Christian Principles, &c.’ in three parts (233
 pages); the two first parts published in 1801, the third
 part in the beginning of 1802: 2d. ‘ A Vindication of
 ‘ Scriptural Unitarianism, &c. in reply to Vindex’s
 ‘ Examination of [the first part of] An Appeal, &c. by
 ‘ Verax’ (124 pages), which came out in 1803: and,
 lastly, ‘ A Narrative of the Proceedings in America,
 ‘ of the Society called Quakers, in the case of Hannah
 ‘ Barnard, &c. intended as a Sequel to An Appeal,
 ‘ &c.’ (145 pages), printed 1804. This last Pamphlet
 contains much extraneous matter very irregularly and
 improperly introduced, such as private, confidential cor-
 respondence, conversations, &c. most of which does not
 admit of a serious reply, and is consequently unnoticed
 in this work: as are likewise the proceedings against
 Hannah Barnard, in America; from the difficulty of
 access to the sources of information. The author of
 these *Pièces* having assumed the name of *Verax*, I have
 also applied it to him, *merely* to prevent circumlocution:
 the same reason has induced me to alter my letter to
 John Evans, by an occasional adoption of it.

On an early perusal of the first part of the *Appeal*, I
 was of opinion that it claimed, and easily admitted of,
 confutation, and was not without thoughts of attempting
 a reply; but the Pamphlet just alluded to, entitled,
 ‘ *An Examination, &c. by Vindex,*’ coming out soon
 after, I dropped my original design; and indulged a
 hope that this writer would pursue the subject, for
 which our opponent in his succeeding publications,
 amply furnished materials. Disappointed in this hope,
 and continuing to feel a solicitude for the cause of

truth, and for the preservation of my brethren in the same faith, from the snare laid for them in the various pamphlets recently published; which, under the phraseology of Scripture, and of the Society,* subtly undermine the fundamental truths of the gospel; I was induced at length to take up the pen: and in addition to these motives, one or two incidents unexpectedly occurred that favoured my design.

In the beginning of the year 1801, a friend of the author of the ‘Sketch of the Denominations’ informed me that a new edition of that work was in the press; I was hence induced to write to John Evans, and propose some corrections in his account of the Friends; not, at that time, doubting it would meet with a candid reception: but although mistaken herein, yet when I saw the note of censure against the Friends, in the seventh edition, I made another attempt to remove the prejudice he had conceived towards them: about the 11th Month 1802 I wrote the letter to him, contained in the first chapter of this work. From the reception this letter met with, I discovered that impartiality was not to be expected from the author of the ‘Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World.’† A few of my friends to

* Some instances of the deceptive phraseology to which I allude, are noticed in page 154 to 156 of this work.

† In page 32, the reader will find, that after mentioning the objects J. E. specifies to be the intention of his Sketch to promote, I add, ‘But to effect these desirable objects, a work still appears to be wanting.’ Since this remark was printed, a publication has come out, entitled, ‘A View of Religions, in three Parts, by Hannah Adams: a new Edition with Corrections and Additions, &c.’ Buxton, London, 8vo. 9s. and 12mo. 6s. which appears to be conducted with impartiality and candour.

whom I showed the letter, thought that printing it might be of service; as tending to explain the principles of the Society, to counteract misrepresentations of their conduct towards Hannah Barnard, and to point out the want of candour in J. Evans.

The *Vindication* published by *Verax*, in 1803, convinced me that this letter took too concise a view of the subjects in dispute, completely to answer the end; and to aim at a refutation of the several treatises in circulation, was incompatible with my other engagements: but having been since that period visited with indisposition, that prevented, at different intervals, the pursuit of my usual avocations, I have employed the leisure these intervals afforded me, in throwing together some remarks; which have swelled to a *volume* what was intended only for a *pamphlet*.

A few verbal variations, and one transposition, may be found in the letter to J. Evans. They are unimportant, but express my intention rather more clearly. There are also annexed a few Strictures on the latter editions of the *Sketch*. This letter and the strictures form the first chapter, and may be considered as comprising a general view of the controversy. In the second, third, and fourth chapters, the sentiments of the first Friends with respect to what is usually called the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ, are examined and displayed by copious extracts from their writings: extracts which will probably appear to those who have not seen the productions of *Verax*, more diffuse than the subjects required. But this, I doubt not, will meet with indulgence from the candid reader, when he reflects that in a work written on the defensive, the author is not at

liberty to choose his own ground. Thus, when Verax produces partial extracts from the works of the early Friends, which do not discover their real opinions, I could not, inapplicable as such extracts might generally appear, pass them over without some notice of the works whence they were taken; lest it should be supposed that the inferences drawn from them were granted.

Nevertheless, after all, I have not servilely followed Verax in all his quotations, since it would have enlarged this work much beyond even its present size; besides, *Vindex's Examination* of the first part of the *Appeal* precluded the necessity of it; for I consider that Vindex's proofs of misquotation remain unanswered.

In these chapters, 'I have adduced much additional, 'and I trust, conclusive evidence, *that the original faith 'of the Society of Friends' was not Socinian.* I do not say *Unitarian*, because although the Socinians have assumed to themselves that appellation, they have no exclusive right to it: for those who believe the Divinity of Christ, are equally strenuous for the Divine *Unity*.

In the fifth and sixth chapters, the Society's belief of the inspiration and divine authority of the Scriptures, is very fully investigated; and I trust it is clearly proved, that the first Friends had not the most remote intention to depreciate the divine authority of those invaluable records, when they advocated the superiority of the Holy Spirit that dictated them.

The four remaining chapters vindicate the several charges exhibited against Hannah Barnard, by the Morning Meeting of Ministers and Elders. The tendency of Verax's animadversions upon these charges, and his

attack upon the validity of the Scriptures, demanded, in my view, a full investigation; and in bestowing this upon them, I have derived considerable assistance from the labours of the learned Lardner, Jortin, Bishops Lowth, and Watson, Paley, and other writers of eminence. The whole is closed with a few remarks on Verax's narrative of the proceedings of the Society in England, in the case of H. Barnard; which remarks exhibit some palpable errors in his statement.

Unaccustomed to appear in the character of an author, and conscious of many defects, I submit my work to a candid public. It lays no claim to 'such advantages as 'a founding name, and the sanction of the Morning 'Meeting'* can give: of the latter, combined, unavoidable circumstances precluded my availing myself; at the same time, I am not aware of a single position in the work, that would not receive the approbation of that meeting; still, as it is thus sent forth without its sanction, and without its help, I must acknowledge myself responsible for whatever errors may have inadvertently escaped me.

Among the causes that operated to my foregoing the revision by the Morning Meeting, which our Society strongly recommends, and to which recommendation I wish to pay due deference, one was, the delay it must have occasioned in the publication; which, if longer retarded, might be deemed unseasonable; another, that that meeting itself was a principal party arraigned by our opponent: but as the work did not come under its inspection, it cannot be accused of judging in its own case,

* Verax's Vindication, p. vii.

nor the performance charged with its partial interference; particularly as I am not myself a member of it.

Religious controversy, inevitable as it sometimes appears, will be reluctantly engaged in by the real Christian, and only when prompted by a sense of duty. Still he may find his path beset with difficulties; and of these it is not the least, that he may at times seem to be wanting in the meekness and charity becoming an advocate of the gospel; when, if a correct discrimination were made, that, to which a reader might attach severity of language, probably would prove to be only close argument. I have wished to keep *within* the bounds of a *just* zeal; and if any instance of deviation be discoverable, I think the want of candour on the other side will be admitted as some apology.

As it is not a delight in controversy that has induced me to take up the pen, so neither shall I resume it to gratify that disposition in another: such contests wound that spirit of divine love, which should be the actuating principle in the breast of every follower of the holy Redeemer; who, in unparalleled love to fallen man, laid aside his glory, subjected himself to the temptations and trials incident to human nature, triumphed over them, and finally offered himself a sacrifice for the salvation of a sinful world.

E R R A T A.

Page	6, line	1, for distinct separate, read distinct and separate
	20, —	12, for its, read that
	31, —	31, for of, read and
	42, —	7, for adds, read, he adds
	45, —	3, for Nazcanzen, read Nazianzen
	61, —	5, for things, read ' things
	68, —	2 ^d 4, of Note, for Greifbach, read Griefbach
	74, —	21, for irreverent, read irrelevant
	106, —	25, f r are not, read are
	110, —	2, for unumquodque, read unumquodque
	122, —	16, f r Jews in the time, read disciples
	124, —	5, of Note, for favouable, read favourable
	146, —	20, for not—he read not to be
	155, —	11, of Note, read I expect, be a practical, &c.
	165, —	39, for do we not, read we do not
	193, —	46, for irrefragible, read irrefragable
	196, —	31, for induced them, read were induced
	204, —	27 ^d 28, for as it pretended, read as is pretended
	207, —	28, for interpolation, read interpolations
	231, —	5, for Smyrnæius, read Smyrnæans
	251, —	33, for Aye, read Ay
	258, —	28, for accedes, read concedes
	270, —	3, from bottom, for were, read was

INTRODUCTION,

*Containing a brief Account of the Church Discipline of the
Society of Friends.*

THERE is no stability in the union of any Society civil or religious, unless it is guided by some rules for its government and conduct, and to regulate the admission or dismissal of members, in consequence of their approving or disapproving the principles upon which it is formed. The necessity that hence follows, for a religious society to adopt some plan of internal government did not escape the attention of our ancient and honourable elder, George Fox; for he was not only instrumental in gathering our Society as a distinct people, but also in establishing the excellent discipline that exists amongst us at this day. The measures pursued by this man of God for the good order and government of the church, were, however, opposed by some, who (like our present opponents) thought them an infringement upon their gospel liberty, and upon the rights of conscience.

The views of G. Fox and his friends with respect to the nature and extent of the church discipline established by them, cannot be more clearly given than in the words of their great advocate Robert Barclay; who also defends them from the objections above mentioned.

‘The power and authority, order and government, we speak of, is such, as a church, meeting, gathering, or assembly, claims towards those, that have or do declare themselves members; who own, believe, and profess the same doctrines and principles of faith with us, and go under the same distinction and denomination; whose escapes, faults, and errors may by our adversaries justly be imputed to us, if not seasonably and Christianly reprov’d, reclaim’d, or condemn’d: for we are not so foolish as to concern ourselves with those who are not of us.’*

By this passage in R. B.’s ‘Anarchy of the Ranters,’ or ‘Treatise on Christian Discipline,’ we learn who were considered

* Barclay’s Works, Edit. 1692. p. 203.

amenable to the discipline established in the Society; and that its object was to prevent the truth from suffering by the errors and misconduct of its members.

The nature of this discipline, and the objects it embraced, are also briefly given by R. Barclay in the following propositions, taken from the same work.

‘ 1st. That in the church of Christ, when it consists of a visible people (for I speak not here of the church in the dark night of apostacy, that consisted not of any society visibly united), gathered into the belief of certain principles, and united in the joint performance of the worship of God, as meeting together, praying, preaching, &c. there is, and still must be, a certain order and government.’

‘ 2d. That this government, as to the outward form of it, consists of certain meetings, appointed principally for that end; yet not so, as to exclude acts of worship, if the Spirit move thereunto.’

‘ 3d. The object of this government is twofold, outwards and inwards. The outwards relate mainly to the care of the poor, of widows and fatherless; where may be also included marriages, and the removing of all scandals in things undeniably wrong: the inwards respect an apostasy either in principles or practices, that have a pretence of conscience; and that either in denying some truths already received and believed, or asserting new doctrines, that ought not to be received. Which again (to subdivide) may either be in things fundamental, and of great moment; or in things of less weight in themselves, yet proceeding from a wrong spirit, and which, in the natural and certain consequence of them, tend to make schisms, divisions, animosities, and in sum, to break that bond of love and unity, that is so needful to be upheld and established in the church of Christ. And here come also under this consideration all emulations, strifes, backbitings, and evil furnishings.’*

These extracts are sufficient for the illustration of the nature and design of the discipline established by our ancestors; but since there are some among us, as there were among them, who may have doubts of the propriety of the second branch of the last proposition, so far as it relates to *principles*, I shall, for their satisfaction, quote Barclay’s answer to the question that might be asked by these, viz.

‘ Whether the church of Christ have power in any cases that are *matters of conscience*, to give a positive sentence and decision, which may be obligatory upon believers?’

* Barclay’s Works, p. 235 and 236.

‘ I answer,’ says Barclay, ‘ affirmatively, she hath; and shall prove it from divers instances, both from Scripture and reason. For first, all principles and articles of faith, which are held doctrinally, are in respect to those that believe them, *matters of conscience*. We know the Papists do out of conscience (such as are zealous among them) adore, worship, and pray to angels, saints, and images, yea, and to the eucharist, as judging it to be really Christ Jesus; and so do others place conscience in things that are absolutely wrong. Now, I say, we being gathered together into the belief of certain principles and doctrines, without any constraint or worldly respect, but by the mere force of truth upon our understanding, and its power and influence upon our hearts; these principles and doctrines, and the practices necessarily depending upon them are, as it were, the terms that have drawn us together, and the bond,* by which we became centred into one body and fellowship, and distinguished from others. Now if any one or more so engaged with us, should arise to teach any other doctrine or doctrines, contrary to these which were [the] ground of our being one, who can deny, but the body hath power in such a case to declare, *This is not according to the truth we profess; and therefore we pronounce such and such doctrines to be wrong; with which we cannot have unity, nor yet any more spiritual fellowship with those as hold them?* And so such cut themselves off from being members, by dissolving the very bond, by which they were linked to the body.’

Further on he says, ‘ If the apostles of Christ of old, and the preachers of the everlasting gospel in this day, had told all people, however wrong they found them in their faith and principles, “ Our charity and love is such, we dare not judge you, nor separate from you; but let us all live in love together, and every one enjoy his own opinion, and all will be well;” how should the nations have been, or what way now can they be, brought to truth and righteousness? Would not the devil love this doctrine well, by which darkness and ignorance, error and confusion, might still continue in the earth unproved and uncondemned.’†

These arguments are so firmly supported by reason and Scripture, that the only question remaining to be solved is, What are the doctrines and principles of the Friends that are

* ‘ Yet this is not so the bond, but that we have also a more inward and invisible, to wit, the Life of Righteousness; whereby we also have unity with the upright seed in all, even in those, whose understandings are not yet so enlightened. But [to] those who are once enlightened, this is as an outward bond, &c.’

† Barclay’s Works, p. 213. 215.

so important as to be denominated their faith? The candid and unprejudiced reader will, I believe, find this question satisfactorily answered in the following pages, to which he is therefore referred.

Having taken a general view of the origin of the church discipline of the Friends, and the objects that it recognizes, I shall proceed to give an account of the regulations that have been adopted, to effect the salutary purposes for which it was instituted.

The meetings established for conducting their internal government; are divided into monthly, quarterly, and yearly, which are so called from the times of their being held.

A Monthly Meeting consists sometimes of a single congregation, but it is more generally composed of several particular congregations, situated within a convenient distance from each other. Its business is, to provide for the subsistence of the poor (the Friends maintaining their own poor), and for the education of their offspring; to judge of the sincerity and fitness of persons appearing to be convinced of their religious principles, and desiring to be admitted into membership; to deal with disorderly members, and if irreclaimable, to disown them. Monthly meetings also grant to such of their members as remove into other monthly meetings, certificates of their membership and conduct; without which they cannot gain membership in the latter. Each monthly meeting is required to appoint certain persons as overseers; who, when any case of complaint, or disorderly conduct, comes to their knowledge, are to see that private admonition, agreeably to the gospel rule, Matt. xviii. 15—17. be given, previously to its being laid before the monthly meeting. And as the Society has always scrupled to acknowledge the exclusive authority of the priests to join persons in marriage, their marriages are conducted among themselves, and proposed to these meetings for their concurrence; which is granted, if, upon enquiry, the parties appear clear of other engagements respecting marriage, and if they also have the consent of their parents or guardians. Their marriages are solemnized in a public meeting for worship; and the monthly meeting keeps a record of them; as also of the births and burials of its members.

Several monthly meetings compose a Quarterly Meeting, to which they send representatives; who are furnished with written answers from the monthly meetings, to certain queries respecting the conduct of their members, and their care over them. The several accounts thus received, the quarterly meeting digests into one, which also is sent, in the form of answers to queries, by representatives to the yearly meeting. Appeals from the judgment of monthly meetings are brought to the

quarterly meetings, whose business, is to assist in any difficult case, or where remissness appears in the care of monthly meetings over the individuals who compose them.

A Yearly Meeting has a general superintendence of the Society, in the country in which it is established; and therefore, as particular exigencies arise, it gives advice, makes such regulations as appear to be requisite, or excites to the observance of those already made. Appeals from the judgment of quarterly meetings are here finally determined.

There are seven yearly meetings, viz. London, to which come representatives from Great Britain and Ireland; New-England; New-York; Pennsylvania and New Jersey; Maryland; Virginia; the Carolinas, and Georgia: and they maintain a brotherly correspondence by epistles with each other; but possess no controul over each other's conduct in the transaction of the affairs of the church.

There are also monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings of Women Friends, held at the same times and places with the men's meetings, in separate apartments; on which devolve those parts of the Christian discipline wherein their own sex are more peculiarly concerned.

Those who believe themselves required to speak in meetings for worship, are not immediately acknowledged as ministers by their monthly meetings; but time is taken for judgment, that the meeting may be satisfied of their call and qualification. It will also sometimes happen, that such as are not approved, will obtrude themselves as ministers, to the grief of their brethren; but much forbearance is used towards these, before the disapprobation of the meeting is publicly testified.

In order that those who are in the situation of ministers may have the tender counsel and advice of those of either sex, who, by their experience in the work of religion, are qualified for that service, the monthly meetings are advised to select such, under the denomination of elders. These, and the ministers approved by their monthly meetings, have meetings peculiar to themselves, called Meetings of Ministers and Elders, or select meetings; in which they have an opportunity of exciting each other to a discharge of their several duties, and of extending advice to those who may appear to be weak, without any needless exposure. Such meetings are generally held in the compass of each monthly, quarterly, and yearly meeting. These are conducted by rules prescribed by the yearly meeting, and have no authority to make any alteration or addition to them. The members of them unite with their brethren in the meetings for discipline, and are *equally accountable* to the latter for their conduct. It is to a meeting of this kind in London, called the Second-day's Morning Meeting, that the revival of

manuscripts concerning their principles, previously to publication, is intrusted by the yearly meeting of London; and also the granting, in the intervals of the yearly meeting, of certificates of approbation to such ministers as are concerned to travel in the work of the ministry in foreign parts; in addition to those granted by their monthly and quarterly meetings. When a visit of this kind doth not extend beyond Great Britain, a certificate from the monthly meeting, of which the minister is a member, is sufficient; if to Ireland, the concurrence of the quarterly meeting is also required. Regulations of similar tendency obtain in other yearly meetings.

I shall subjoin, to the preceding account,* a few observations. From what is above stated, we see that *those only* who are in the station of ministers or elders, come under the care of those meetings; and also that ministers who think their duty calls them to travel in foreign parts, are to apply to the morning meeting, or select yearly meeting, for a certificate expressive of its unity with their ministry, and approbation of their proposed journey.

The subsequent minute more particularly sets forth the business of the meetings of ministers and elders, and as I have had occasion to refer to it in the following work, I insert it here.

‘The morning meeting of ministers in London, and every other meeting of ministers, have a right, as they see meet in the wisdom of truth, to advise, exhort, and rebuke any of their members, or any one who may travel in the work of the ministry, as occasion may require, without being accountable for the same to any monthly or quarterly meeting. *But if any member of the said meetings, or any other minister, should at any time be overtaken with a fault, and the same be under the cognizance of the morning or any other meeting of ministers, and the monthly meeting to which such person belongs, shall also deal with him or her for the same; then, on notice from such monthly meeting, that they have taken the case under their care, all proceedings of the morning or other meeting of ministers, against such minister or elder shall be finally stopped.*† Neither the morning meeting, nor any other meeting of ministers, have power to disown any minister, or other person, in any capacity whatsoever; this solely belonging to the monthly, quarterly, half-yearly, or yearly meetings, 1735.‡

Verax says that ‘the gradual extension of the power and influence of the select meetings,—have produced the greatest

* Taken principally from ‘A Summary of the History, Doctrine, and Discipline of Friends.’

† Verax notices this rule both in the *Appeal* and *Sequel*, but in neither does he trust his reader with the part distinguished by Italics. Was he not conscious that if he had, the reader must have seen the morning meeting, in the case of H. Barnard, acted quite consistently with it?

‡ Book of Extracts, 2d Edit. p. 103, 104.

‘ change in the constitution of the Society, that has taken place since its first establishment!’* Well might it be said by Vindex, ‘ Here is surely some inaccuracy.’ What *proof* have we to support this ‘ positive assertion?’ a few regulations made by the yearly meeting relating to mere matters of order; which could neither increase nor diminish the power and influence of the select meetings. The restricting the attendance of them to their proper members, could certainly be no deviation from their original institution. What rule has been lately made, that extended their power beyond what they before possessed by the rule of 1735? And can a single instance be produced of their having exercised a power not authorized by that rule? That those who are in the station of ministers or elders (supposing them rightly qualified for these important stations), have a consequent degree of influence in the respective meetings of discipline to which they belong, is in the natural order of things; but I believe from observation it will be found, that this influence has been, of late years, ‘ rather on the decline than the ‘ increase:’ besides, the influence they possess in the meetings of discipline, is in their individual, and not in their collective capacity. It therefore cannot have been affected by any of the more recent regulations respecting their meetings.

The Society has also Meetings for Sufferings, which are composed of Friends chosen by the several quarterly meetings. They were originally instituted, and thus named, in times of persecution; and are continued to superintend the general concerns of the Society, during the interval of the yearly meetings.

From the foregoing account, we see the origin of the church discipline of Friends, and the manner in which it is now conducted. The lapse of above a century since its first establishment may have produced a few new regulations, but I believe these would be found to be improvements; and they are such as have occasioned no material deviation in the discipline by our ancestors.

Those whose principles or conduct make them amenable to it, may, in their own vindication, represent it as an imposition on liberty of conscience, and nearly allied to persecution; but let such, divesting themselves of prejudice, seriously reflect, that ‘ when any, by their inconsistent and disorderly conduct, or by ‘ imbibing and adopting principles and practices contrary to ‘ the doctrine which we have received, have first openly manifested their disunity with the Society, it is but just and ‘ requisite that, after endeavouring and waiting to restore them ‘ without effect, the body should testify its disunity with such ‘ erring and refractory members; at the same time earnestly

' desiring that they may be convinced of the error of their
 ' ways, and that through unfeigned repentance, and a consist-
 ' ent, orderly conduct in future, they may be reunited to the
 ' body. This being the utmost extent of our discipline respect-
 ' ing offenders, it is very evident, that from the right exercise
 ' thereof no degree of persecution or imposition can be justly
 ' inferred; for the imposition rests entirely on the part of those
 ' who insist on being retained as members, whilst at open va-
 ' riance with the body either in principle or practice.*

* ' Extracts from the Minutes and Advices of the Yearly Meeting
 ' held in London,' 2d Ed. Preface, p. v. vi. The reader who desires
 further information respecting the Discipline, may consult this work :
 and for an answer to some of the objections to the exercise of the Dis-
 cipline, see an excellent little piece, just published, entitled, ' The
 ' Principles of Religion as professed by the Society of Christians,
 ' usually called Quakers, &c. by Henry Tuke.' Phillips and Fardon,
 2s. 6d. boards.

CHAP. I.

Remarks on the Seventh Edition of JOHN EVANS'S Sketch, including a brief account of the Proceedings of the Society of FRIENDS against HANNAH BARNARD, in a Letter to the Author; together with some Strictures on the Eighth and Ninth Editions of his Work.

RESPECTED FRIEND,

WHEN I wrote to thee some time since concerning a few inaccuracies in thy account of the Society of Friends given in the Sketch, I hoped there would have been no further occasion to trouble thee again upon the same subject; as I apprehended thou wast in possession of sufficient information respecting the sentiments of that Society to have given a true account of their principles; but though in thy last editions thou hast been more particular in thy description of the Quakers, yet, instead of elucidating their principles, it has rather had the contrary effect: thou also indirectly chargest them with *persecution*, and being under the influence of *prejudice* and *passion*. I therefore propose pointing out what appears to be incorrect in thy account of that Society; trusting that if thou have really '*no interest to promote but that of truth*,' it will prevent thee from pursuing a conduct which thou hast represented as '*incompatible with glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men*.'

Respecting the Resurrection of the Body, thou observest that 'Barclay, in his Confession and Catechism, used only the words of Scripture on the subject, without expressing the manner in which he understood them,' and then addest, 'The same remark applies to Barclay's account of the Divinity of Christ.' From which observations, particularly the last, I conclude thou hast not read his Catechism, for the form in

which his questions are drawn up sufficiently explains to a candid reader, in what sense he understands the Scriptures he advances in answer; for example, his second question respecting the Resurrection shows that he believed in a resurrection of good and bad; and his fourth question, that he believed a spiritual body would rise, and not that natural body which we have now: as thou mayst see, if thou wilt examine Barclay's Catechism, which I put into thy hands.

The Divinity of Christ being a doctrine respecting which the Society of Friends have of late been much misrepresented; and as I apprehend thou mayst have read the Appeal to the Friends, alluded to in thy Sketch, I shall insert Barclay's questions and answers* upon that subject in his Catechism.

Quest.—“ Was not Jesus Christ in being before he appeared in the flesh? what clear Scriptures prove this, against such as *erroneously assert the contrary?* ”

Ans.—“ But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting.† In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.—Jesus said unto them, Verily, Verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.—And now, O Father, Glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.‡ And to make all men see, what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ.§ For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: All things were created by him, and for him.|| God hath in these days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds.”¶

Quest.—“ These are very clear that even the *world was created by Christ*; but what Scriptures prove the Divinity of Christ against such as *falsely deny the same?* ”

Ans.—“ And the word was God.** Whose are the Fathers; and of whom as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over

* In the manuscript, brevity induced me to give, in the answers, only the references to the texts quoted by Barclay.

† Mich. v. 2. ‡ John i. 2, 3. viii. 58. xvii. 5.

§ Ephes. iii. 9. || Col. i. 16. ¶ Heb. i. 2. ** John i. 1.

“all, God blessed for ever, Amen.* Who, being in the form of
 “God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God.† And we
 “know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an
 “understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we
 “are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ: this is
 “the true God, and eternal Life.”‡

Quest.—‘What are the glorious names the Scripture gives
 ‘unto Jesus Christ, the *Eternal Son of God*?’

Ans.—“And his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor,
 “the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of
 “Peace.§ Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-
 “born of every creature.|| Who being the brightness of his
 “glory, and the express image of his person, (or more properly
 “according to the Greek, of his substance).‡ And he was
 “clothed with a vesture dipt in blood, and his name is called
 “the word of God.”***

Quest.—‘After what manner was the birth of Christ?’

Ans.—“Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise:
 “when as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, (before
 “they came together) she was found with child of the Holy
 “Ghost.†† And the angel said unto her, Fear not, Mary, for
 “thou hast found favour with God: And behold thou shalt
 “conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shalt call
 “his name Jesus: he shall be great, and shall be called the Son
 “of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the
 “throne of his father David. Then said Mary unto the
 “Angel, How shall this be, seeing I know not a man? And
 “the Angel answered and said unto her, the Holy Ghost shall
 “come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall over-
 “shadow thee: therefore also that holy thing that shall be
 “born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.”‡‡

Quest.—‘After what manner doth the Scripture assert the
 ‘conjunction and unity of the *Eternal Son of God* in and with
 ‘the *Man Christ Jesus*?’

Ans.—“And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among
 “us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten
 “of the Father) full of grace and truth.§§ For he, whom God
 “hath sent, speaketh the words of God; for God giveth not
 “the spirit by measure unto him.||| Now God anointed Jesus
 “of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power; who
 “went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed
 “of the devil, for God was with him.”*** For it pleased the

* Rom. ix. 5. † Phil. ii. 6. ‡ 1 John v. 20. § Isai. ix. 6.
 || Col. i. 15. ‡ Heb. i. 3. ** Rev. xix. 13. †† Matth. i. 18.
 ‡‡ Luke i. 30, 31, 32, 34, 35.
 §§ John i. 14. ||| John iii. 34. *** Acts x. 38.

“ Father, that in him should all fulness dwell. For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.” §

In the foregoing Questions, Barclay seems to have carefully guarded against any misconception of his sentiments, by presenting them as much as possible in the form of assertions, and which, in his answers, he supports by the most appropriate Scriptures he could produce.—It also appears from the above, that Barclay did fully believe in the authenticity of the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, respecting the birth of Christ; and therefore could have no allusion to them, when he speaks of the inaccuracies of the *vulgar translations*, as Verax would insinuate in the 2d part of the Appeal, page 88.

But Barclay’s Catechism is not the only place wherein we are to look for his belief in the Divinity of Christ, he having fully and *explicitly* expressed himself thereupon in his Apology, as follows :

‘ For the Infinite and most wise God who is the foundation, root, and spring of all operation, hath wrought all things by his Eternal Word and Son.—This is that Word, that was in the beginning with God, and was God; by whom all things were made, and without whom was not any thing made, that was made. This is that Jesus Christ, by whom God created all things, by whom and for whom all things were created, that are in heaven and in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, Col. i. 16. As then that infinite and incomprehensible fountain of life and motion operateth in the creatures by his own eternal word and power, so no creature has access again unto him but in and by the Son, according to his own express words; “ No man knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal him.” Matth. xi. 27. Luke x. 22. And again he himself saith, “ I am the way, the truth, and the life, no man cometh unto the Father but by me.” John xiv. 6. Hence he is fitly called the mediator betwixt God and man. For *having been with God from all eternity, being himself God, and also in time partaking of the nature of Man,* through him is the goodness and love of God conveyed to mankind, and by him again man receiveth and partaketh of these mercies.’—2 Prop. § 5.

From the above extract, as well as that from Barclay’s Catechism, thou mayst see that the Author of the Appeal is unwarranted in his supposition that Barclay did not consider Col. i. 16. to allude to the creation of the world, but to the new creation, as the Unitarians explain it, to make it harmonize with their

disbelief in the divinity and pre-existence of Christ, whom they consider as only the son of Joseph and Mary.

The following paragraph in page 151 of the Sketch* appears more likely to mislead the reader, than to give information: 'And no writer of acknowledged reputation amongst them has admitted any distinction of persons in the Deity.' It is true that they have uniformly objected to the school terms, persons, subsistences, or substances; as applied to the Deity; but if from thence the reader was to conclude they disbelieved in the Scriptural doctrine of the Trinity, he would fall into an error, as the following extract from William Penn's 'Key to the Quakers' Religion and Perversions of it' may serve to prove.

'Perversion 9.—The Quakers deny the Trinity.

'Principles.—Nothing less: they believe in the holy Three or the Trinity of Father, Word, and Spirit, according to the Scriptures, and that these three are truly and properly one: of one nature as well as will, but they are very tender of quitting Scripture terms and phrases for schoolmens,' such as distinct and separate persons and subsistences, &c. are, from whence people are apt to entertain gross ideas and notions of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and they judge that a curious enquiry into these high and divine relations, and other speculative subjects, though never so great truths in themselves, tend little to godliness, and less to peace.'†

William Penn, in his Works, Vol. II. page 879, Fol. Edit. also asserts the Friends' belief in the Trinity, and complains of those who, in order to lessen their religious reputation, have represented them as deniers of the Trinity.

'The Sandy Foundation Shaken,' is a tract far from being the best calculated of Penn's Works to give the reader a clear view of his real sentiments, it being controversial, and that more about *words* than *things*. He seems to have been himself aware that he might be misunderstood, and has therefore, towards the latter part of the work, given the following caution: 'Mistake me not, we have never disowned a Father, Word, and Spirit, which are one, but men's inventions.'—But this explanation, not suiting the design of the author of the Appeal, was, no doubt, after due *examination*, upon his *discriminating* principle, withheld from the view of his readers.

Richard Claridge, who was contemporary with William Penn, and who therefore must be supposed to be in possession of his real sentiments; upon his Sandy Foundation Shaken, writes as follows:—

'That which William Penn refuted was not the doctrine of the holy Trinity, as it is declared of in the Scriptures of Truth;

* 9th Edit. p. 160. † Penn's Works, Fol. Edit. Vol. II. p. 783.

‘ but the notion of three distinct separate persons, as the title
 ‘ page plainly shows : for W. P. sincerely owned and doth own
 ‘ the Scripture Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.—Mat.
 ‘ xxviii. 19. 1 Tim. ii. 5, &c. And whatever the holy Scriptures
 ‘ testify concerning him, we unfeignedly believe: but the invented
 ‘ phrases of three distinct and separate persons, we use not,
 ‘ because they are unscriptural, and because they that do use
 ‘ them,—as they are forced to acknowledge they are no Scripture
 ‘ phrases, so neither are they agreed about the explication of
 ‘ them, but have contradicted and written one against another—
 ‘ and darken and expose the mystery itself through their cloudy
 ‘ and incoherent interpretations. And as we distinguish be-
 ‘ tween a Scripture Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,
 ‘ which we unfeignedly believe, and that humanly devised
 ‘ Trinity of three distinct and separate persons, which we re-
 ‘ ceive not, because the holy Scriptures make no mention of it;
 ‘ so we distinguish between the Scripture redemption and the
 ‘ vulgar doctrine of satisfaction: the first we receive, the second
 ‘ we reject.’ And after stating the contrariety between the
 vulgar doctrine of satisfaction and the Scripture account of the
 redemption, he says. ‘ And if any thing besides or contrary to
 ‘ the Scriptures, be required of us, as an article of faith in com-
 ‘ mon to be believed as necessary to salvation, we reject it.*

Richard Claridge has so very *explicitly* expressed Friends’ be-
 lief in Christ, that I trust no apology will be necessary for in-
 serting it in this place.

‘ We do believe, that he was and is both *God* and *Man*, in
 ‘ wonderful union, not a God by creation or office, as †some
 ‘ hold; nor man by the assumption of an human body only,
 ‘ without a reasonable soul, as ‡ others; nor that the manhood
 ‘ was swallowed up of the Godhead, as a § third sort grossly
 ‘ fancy, but *God uncreated*. See John i. 1 to 3. Col. i. 17. Heb.
 ‘ i. 8 to 12. “ The true God,” 1 John v. 20. “ The great
 “ God.” Tit. ii. 13. “ The Lord of glory.” James ii. 1.
 “ King of kings, and Lord of lords.” Rev. xix. 16. “ Which is,
 “ which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.” Rev. i. 8.
 “ The same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.” Heb. xiii. 8. ‘ And
 ‘ *Man*|| conceived by the *Holy Ghost*, and born of the *Virgin Mary*,
 ‘ see Luke i. 31, 35. “ Who suffered for our salvation.”
 ‘ Hath “ given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God,
 “ for a sweet smelling savour,” Eph. v. 2. And “ by his own
 “ blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained†”

* Claridge’s Life and Posthumous Works, p. 421, 422, 423, 437.

† Arians and Socinians. ‡ Apollinarians. § Eutychians.

|| Creed, commonly called the Apostles’.

↓ εὐαγγέλιον.

‘or found, as the word signifies,’ “eternal redemption for us.”
 ‘Heb. ix. 12’.*

I have been induced to be more particular on this subject, from an apprehension that thou mayst have been misinformed, and also from knowing that the author of the Appeal has left nothing undone that his ingenuity could devise to misrepresent Friends’ real sentiments: ample proofs of which may be seen in Vindex’s Answer to the first part of that work. Barclay, Fox, and Penington, have, in various parts of their works, *fully* expressed their belief in the Trinity, and in the divinity of Christ; but I hope sufficient has been advanced to satisfy thee respecting their sentiments in those points, and that there is no proximity between them and modern Unitarianism, with which the Author of the Appeal has not scrupled to charge them.

I now submit for thy consideration, whether the extract from Penn’s Key, only beginning with, ‘They believe in the Holy ‘Three,’ &c. will not give his sentiments with more perspicuity than the title page of his ‘Sandy Foundation Shaken,’ as it expresses what he believes as well as what he disbelieves. Also instead of the extract thou hast given from Penn’s ‘Innocency ‘with her open face,’ page 152†, and which throws but little, if any light, upon his sentiments; suppose the following extract from the same work was inserted; it is shorter than the one for which it is substituted, and more illustrative of his belief in Christ; viz.

‘This conclusive argument for the proof of Christ, the Saviour, ‘being God, should certainly persuade all sober persons of my innocence, and my adversaries malice. He, that is the everlasting ‘wisdom, the divine power, the true light, the only saviour, the ‘creating word of all things, (whether visible or invisible) and ‘their upholder by his own power, is without contradiction ‘God; but all these qualifications and divine properties are, by ‘the concurrent testimonies of Scripture, ascribed to the Lord ‘Jesus Christ, therefore without a scruple, I call and believe ‘him really to be the mighty God.’

In page 155† thou remarkest that ‘There seems to be a ‘much greater uniformity in their dress than in their opinions.’ If thou intend hereby to intimate that they are less established in their belief of the fundamental doctrines of the gospel, than the members of other Christian societies, such an implication is unfounded and injurious. That the same religious truths will impress the human mind variously, is evident from the different explanations of the same truths, given by those, who notwith-

* Claridge’s Life and Works, p. 441, 442.

† 9th Ed. p. 161

‡ 9th Edit. p. 164.

standing unite in their belief and defence of them against gain-sayers; but this observation applies equally to the members of any religious society—for proof whereof we need go no farther than the Church of England.

‘As a proof of the diversity of opinion amongst them,’ thou sayst ‘we may refer to the late proceedings of the Society against Hannah Barnard, a celebrated speaker from Hudson, in North America. For her opinion concerning the Jewish wars, Trinity, miraculous conception, &c. she has been silenced.’* The proceedings alluded to in the above passage, are, according to my apprehension, so far from being a proof of a diversity of opinion, that they rather evince the Society as a religious body, to adhere to the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, which H. B. endeavoured to undermine. Neither is the reason assigned for the Society’s silencing H. B. quite correct; for it was on account of her not acknowledging the truth of the Scriptures in several important instances, ‘particularly those parts of the Old Testament which assert the Almighty commanded the Israelites to make war upon other nations, and various parts of the New Testament relative to the miracles and miraculous conception of Christ.’ I do not find that she was at all questioned respecting the Trinity, or the subject even introduced excepting by herself. With respect to the miracles recorded by the Evangelists, if they were not true, then those accounts, in which they are so interwoven with the rest of the narrative, as to be inseparable, must be considered as impositions on mankind; the consequence is unavoidable. And though H. B. was too wary to acknowledge the full extent of her incredulity respecting the miracles of Christ, she has nevertheless expressed her disbelief in the *account* of that most transcendent miracle, the resurrection of Christ’s body from the grave. A miracle, the truth of which is so intimately connected with the truth of the Christian religion, that the apostle declares; “If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain and your faith is also vain, yea, and we be found false witnesses of God; because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ.” &c.

And I know not a single society calling itself Christian, that, however incredulous in other respects, does not fully believe in the resurrection of Christ.

Sincerity of heart claims our respect, even when it is to be found in those, who may differ from us widely in their religious opinions: but when I reflect that H. Barnard entirely discards the *necessity* of a belief in the truth of the evangelical accounts of Christ, or even of a belief in his outward coming at all, to

form a member of a Christian Society, and notwithstanding claims the privilege of being considered as a gospel minister of Jesus Christ, it is difficult to give her more credit for *honesty* or *integrity* than thou hast given to Deists in the 4th edition of thy Sketch, page 136, viz.—‘ Of their *honesty* we may form ‘ a tolerable judgment from the *oblique mode* in which Christianity has been uniformly attacked. Scarcely a Deist has ‘ come forward with an *open avowal* of his *intention*, but skulking ‘ behind some unconsecrated altar, aims a deadly blow at the best ‘ and purest system of religion which has been ever instituted.’ For however H. B. and the Deists may differ in other respects, in their mode of attacking Christianity they seem to be perfectly agreed. I regret that the excellent paragraph from which the above extract is taken, and that that immediately follows it, are omitted in the last editions of the Sketch, for though they may appear to be severe, they are not more so than truth will justify.

I am no advocate for requiring subscriptions to any formal articles of faith, believing them to be insufficient to prove the influence of vital religion upon the heart; without which, a mere subscription to, or acquiescence in, any set of opinions, however true or important in themselves, will be of no avail in the sight of a heart-searching God. We should not however be indifferent to the *religious principles* of those with whom we *unite in religious fellowship*: for I believe our *sentiments* have a much greater influence upon our *moral conduct*, than many are willing to believe: neither are we to suppose that a Christian society, because it does not require a subscription to articles of faith, as a test of its members, is indifferent respecting the fundamental doctrines of the gospel; nor that it does not consider its duty calls upon it to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, when it apprehends that faith to be attacked. Much less can it be supposed, it would quietly suffer such an attack to be made by one of its members, not to say one of its ministers, whilst remaining in that capacity; for it would thus make itself accessory to such an opposition to the faith.

Though our first friends never required any subscription to articles of faith, they were neither inexplicit in their declarations of their faith; nor supine in defending it when attacked. As a proof of their zeal in the latter instance, we may refer to Penn’s ‘ Spirit of Truth vindicated,’ in his works, Fo. Edit. Vol. 2. p. 130. After having proved in opposition to his Socinian antagonist, that Christ really alluded to his own pre-existence in a state of glory before the world was, and not to a glory given by decree only before the world was, as the Socinian explained it in opposition to George Fox; he proceeds, ‘ And it is a piece ‘ of sacrilege and ingratitude, I almost tremble to think on, that ‘ because he (Christ) was pleased to descend in the likeness of

‘men, in order to the salvation of mankind (in which our adversary also may have his share if he unfeignedly repent), he should unworthily rob him of all pre-existence in the form of God, whilst he himself, thought it no robbery to be equal with God; so that, though in his humble estate and fashion of a man, he could not properly be said to be glorified, and therefore prayed to be so, yet it is no right consequence, that therefore he never was before.—This is the great mystery of the Socinians, indeed the rock on which they split, they do not distinguish betwixt the form of God, and the likeness of men, that which came into the world to do the will of God, and the body he took, in which to perform it.’

The author of the Appeal, in the 2d and 3d parts of that work, has brought into view R. Barclay’s Letter to Adrian Paets, as particularly consonant with H. Barnard’s incredulity in the Scripture account of miracles, if not exceeding it, also making the same distinction between doctrinal truths and historical facts, that she so repeatedly enforced, in the defence of her opinions; I shall therefore endeavour to remove the shade thrown over the sentiments of that able advocate of the cause of Christianity, R. Barclay.*

The Letter to Adrian Paets may be considered as a chain of metaphysical reasoning in defence of ‘the possibility and necessity of the inward and immediate revelation of the Spirit of God towards the foundation and ground of true faith,’ which the said Adrian Paets denied, on the following hypothesis: ‘That since the being and substance of the Christian religion consisteth in the knowledge of, and faith concerning, the birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ Jesus—the substance of the Christian religion is a contingent truth, which contingent truth is matter of fact;’ from which he argues, ‘Matter of fact cannot be known but by the relation of another, or by the perception of the outward senses, because there are naturally in our souls no ideas of contingent truths, such as are concerning necessary truths: to wit, that God is; and that The whole is greater than a part; and since it may without absurdity be said that God cannot make a contingent truth to become a necessary truth; neither can God reveal contingent truths or matters of fact, but as contingent truths are revealed; but matters of fact are not revealed, but by the outward senses.’ From which argument he draws the following conclusion, ‘That men are not even obliged to believe God producing any revelation in the soul concern-

* This paragraph is a little varied from the manuscript, in consequence of a transposition of the Remarks upon R. B.’s letter, in order that the observations upon doctrinals should follow each other without interruption.

‘ing matter of fact, whether of a thing done, or to be done, unless there be added some miracles obvious to the outward senses, by which the soul may be ascertained that that revelation cometh from God.’—I have given Adrian Paets’s objections to revelation at large, the better to show the drift of Barclay’s answer to him. He premises,

1st. *That it is falsely supposed that the essence of the Christian religion consists in the historical faith and knowledge of the birth, death, life, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. That faith and historical knowledge is indeed a part of the Christian religion; but not such an essential part, as that without which the Christian religion cannot consist; but an integral part, which goes to the compleating the Christian religion: as the hands or feet of a man are integral parts of a man, without which nevertheless a man may exist,* but not an entire and complete man.*

2dly. *‘If by immediate revelation be understood such a revelation of God, as begets in our souls an historical faith and knowledge of the birth of Christ in the flesh, without the means of the holy Scriptures, we do not contend for such a revelation, as commonly given, or to be expected by us or any other Christians: for albeit many other evangelical truths be manifested to us by the immediate manifestation of God, not using the Scripture as the means; yet the historical knowledge of Christ is not commonly manifested to us, nor to any others, but by the holy Scripture as the means, and that by way of a material object; even as when we see the person of Peter or Paul to our visive faculty immediately, yet not without the medium of that person concurring as a material object to produce that sight, while the light of the sun concurs as the formal object of that vision or sight: so that when we livingly and scripturally know the history of the birth of Christ in the flesh; the inward revelation or illumination of God, which is like the sun’s light, proceeding from the divine Sun, doth shine into the eye of the mind, and by its influence moves the mind to assent unto the historical truth of Christ’s birth, life, &c. in the reading or hearing the Scripture, or meditating therein.*

3dly. Nevertheless we do firmly assert, that God can most easily, clearly, and certainly manifest to our minds the his-

* The following Note in ‘Penn’s General Rule of Faith and Practice,’ will illustrate this argument. ‘Justin Martyr saith, “That all are Christians who live with Christ, as Abraham and Elias; and amongst the Greeks, as Socrates, Heraclitus,” &c. See Scultetus on him, who also saith, that some at this day are of his judgment, who have taught that “Melchizedek, Abimelech, Ruth, Rachab, the queen of Sheba, Hiram of Tyre, Naaman the Syrian, and the city of Nineveh, are in the catalogue of Christians.” Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 593.

‘ torical truths of Christ’s birth, &c. when it so pleaseth him, even without the Scripture or any other outward mean. And because this argument seems to be formed against the possibility of such a revelation, therefore I shall proceed to discuss it: but first thou mayst mind that the prophets who foretold Christ’s coming in the flesh, and being to be born of a virgin, and afterwards to suffer death,* did know these truths of fact by the inward inspiration of God without outward means: for which, see 1 Peter i. 10, 11. now that which hath been, may be.

4thly. This argument doth at most conclude that we cannot know naturally any truth of fact, but by the relation of another without us, or by the perception of the outward senses; because there are naturally in our minds no ideas concerning contingent truths (and every truth of fact is a contingent truth), as there are of necessary truths: this then proveth, that we cannot naturally know any contingent truth, but by the relation of another, or perception of the outward senses: But that hindereth not, but we may know a contingent truth by a supernatural knowledge, God supplying the place of the outward relator; who is so true, that he may and ought to be believed, sith God is the fountain of truth.†

The quotation, which, in the Appeal, immediately follows the preceding, is in page 902, and does not allude to the revelation of contingent truths, but to the divine and spiritual senses by which ‘ spiritual-minded men do behold the glory and beauty of God,’ and whereby ‘ they also hear God inwardly speaking in their souls, words truly divine and heavenly, full of virtue, and divine life, and they savour and taste of divine things, and do as it were handle them with the hands of their souls. [And those heavenly enjoyments do as really differ in their nature from all false similitudes and fictitious appearances of them,—as a true man differs from the dead image of a man.—And albeit either the imagination of man or subtilty of the devil may counterfeit false likenesses of these enjoyments by which men may be deceived, that doth not hinder but] ‡ that those divine enjoyments are clearly perceived in such, in whom the divine and spiritual senses are truly opened, and the true and supernatural ideas of these things truly raised up. And if

* It is worthy of notice in this place, that H. Barnard does not believe the 53d Chapter of Isaiah to have any more allusion to Christ than to any of his followers—also that Chap. vii. ver. 14. of the same prophet was not prophetic of the miraculous conception of Christ, notwithstanding the testimony of the Evangelist to the contrary. They seem too descriptive of the character of Christ as our Saviour and Redeemer, to meet with her cordial approbation or belief.

† Barclay’s Works, Fol. Edit. p. 894 to 896.

‡ What is inclosed between the brackets was not quoted in the manuscript.

‘there be at any time a mistake, the divine illumination is not the cause of that mistake, but some evil disposition of the mind, &c.’ In the foregoing extracts the italics shew what is omitted in the Appeal.

Barclay, in the 5th and 6th Propositions, § 15, of his Apology, has more clearly explained the nature of the distinction he makes between the essence of the Christian religion, and the historical faith and knowledge of Christ, wherein treating upon the universal and saving light of Christ, he proceeds as follows:—

‘We do not hereby intend any ways to lessen or derogate from the atonement and sacrifice of Jesus Christ; but, on the contrary, do magnify and exalt it. For as we believe all those things to have been certainly transacted, which are recorded in the holy Scriptures concerning the birth, life, miracles, sufferings, resurrection, and ascension of Christ; so we do also believe that it is the duty of every one to believe it, to whom it pleases God to reveal the same, and to bring to them the knowledge of it; yea, we believe it were damnable unbelief not to believe it when so declared; but to resist that holy seed, which as minded^d would lead and incline every one to believe it, as it is offered unto them; though it revealeth not in every one the outward and explicit knowledge of it, nevertheless it always assenteth to it, *ubi declaratur*, where it is declared. Nevertheless, as we firmly believe it was necessary that Christ should come, that by his death and sufferings he might offer up himself a sacrifice to God for our sins, who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree; so we believe that the remission of sins, which any partake of, is only in and by virtue of that most satisfactory sacrifice, and no otherwise. For it is by the obedience of that one, that the free gift is come upon all unto justification. For we affirm, that as all men partake of the fruit of Adam’s fall, in that by reason of that evil seed, which through him is communicated unto them, they are prone and inclined unto evil, though thousands of thousands be ignorant of Adam’s fall, neither ever knew of the eating of the forbidden fruit; so also many may come to feel the influence of this holy and divine seed and light, and be turned from evil to good by it, though they knew nothing of Christ’s coming in the flesh, through whose obedience and sufferings it is purchased unto them. And as we affirm it is absolutely needful that those do believe the history of Christ’s outward appearance, whom it pleased God to bring to the knowledge of it; so we do freely confess, that even that outward knowledge is very comfortable to such as are subject to and led by the inward seed

‘and light. The *history* then is profitable and comfortable
 ‘with the *mystery*, and never without it, but the *mystery* is and
 ‘may be profitable without the explicit and outward know-
 ‘ledge of the *history*.’*

Barclay’s *Mystery* and *History* of the Christian Religion in this passage exactly correspond with the *essential* and *integral* parts thereof, mentioned in his letter to Adrian Paets, are perfectly consistent with the rest of his works, and a complete confutation of the perversion of his sentiments in the Appeal.

In answer to Paets’s unscriptural position that God could not reveal indubitably to the mind matter of fact to come to pass at a future period, unless he added some miracle obvious to the outward senses; Barclay remarks,

‘If we will hear the Scripture (as all Christians ought) it testifies to us, that God hath declared his mind and will, even concerning contingent truths to come, in the prophets; as that of the first to the Hebrews doth evidently declare: “God who at sundry times and in divers manners spoke to our fathers by the prophets.” Yea, let us hear the prophets themselves: Hosea, chap. i. saith plainly, That the word of the Lord was made in him (as it is in the Hebrew); Habakkuk also says, As he was standing on his watch to see what Jehovah would speak in him. And it is so manifest that the most heavenly revelations are by inward illustrations and inspirations on the very minds of the prophets, that it is strange how any, that believe the Scriptures should doubt it. And if it happened at any time, such revelations were made in the natural imaginations of the prophets, or any of their inward natural senses,† then it may be confessed, they could not be infallibly certain they came from God; unless they also felt God in the divine and supernatural senses, by which they did most nearly approach to him, from these superior and most inward senses working upon the lower and less noble faculties of the mind. But which ever way the prophets were certain that they were inspired of God, even when they foretold contingent truths to come; it is without doubt they were most certainly persuaded that they were divinely inspired, and that frequently without any outward miracle; for John the Baptist did no miracle, and many prophesied when there appeared no miracle, as in the Scripture may be often observed. And we also by the inspiration of the same divine Spirit, by which the prophets prophesied, do believe their words and writings to be divine concerning contingent truths,

* Barclay’s *Apology*, 8th Edit. p. 141, 142.

† That this has not the most distant allusion to miracles, (as represented in the Appeal) may be seen by comparing it with the extract from Barclay, p. 12, as well as by the context.

‘ as well past, as to come,* else that faith by which we believe the Scriptures would not be divine, but merely human; and thence we need no outward miracle, to move us to believe the Scriptures, and therefore much less were they necessary to the prophets who writ them.†

I cannot discover in the above extract the least trait of incredulity respecting the miracles recorded in the Scriptures. Barclay only proves, and that from *these very Scriptures*, that the revelation of the Spirit of God upon the minds of the prophets respecting future events, was presented to the mind with such indisputable clearness, as to render an outward miracle unnecessary to confirm the truth of such revelations to the prophets; the propriety and justness of which observation cannot be questioned by any who believe in divine revelation and the Scriptures.

The fertile genius of the author of the Appeal has even pressed Barclay’s belief in the Scripture account of miracles into his service. Barclay says, ‘ And there are (as the Scripture affirms) false miracles, which, as to the outward senses, cannot be distinguished from the true:’ evidently alluding to the magicians of Egypt, who, by their enchantments, performed the same miracles, as to the outward appearance, as Moses did. It will not be difficult to give H. B. full credit for her incredulity respecting any of these recorded miracles, whether performed by Moses or the magicians; but it must be an uncommon sagacity that can discover either that Barclay was incredulous respecting miracles, or wished to lessen the force or authority of what is recorded in the Scriptures relative to them.

That a co-operation of the Spirit of God upon the mind is necessary to produce that effect upon it, which is proposed by any outward miraculous interposition of the Deity (and this is the whole that Barclay contends for), must be admitted; for how can we otherwise account for that flagrant obduracy and perverseness of the scribes, pharisees, and chief priests of the Jews, who, notwithstanding they were eye-witnesses of the miracles of Christ, instead of acknowledging the Divine Power by which they were wrought, blasphemed and put to death the Lord of life and glory.

It is difficult to do full justice to R. Barclay’s letter to Adrian Paets by extracts only, his chain of argument being thereby unavoidably more or less broken; nevertheless, I trust thou wilt

* Does Barclay manifest the most remote intention to invalidate the scripture testimony respecting contingent or historical truths, when he asserts that the Friends believe the writings which contain them, to be not merely true records, but *divine*?

† Barclay’s Works, p. 903.

be enabled to form a more correct judgment of the tendency of the arguments advanced, by the extracts here cited, than from those given in the Appeal; and I apprehend they will admit of the following deductions, viz.

1st. That R. Barclay did not consider a knowledge of the outward coming of Christ, and a consequent faith in him as the Messiah, so essential to that salvation, which can only be obtained through Christ, as to exclude those from the benefit of his coming, who are placed by Providence under a moral impossibility of attaining to such a knowledge and faith; if they do but attend to the influence of Christ's spirit in their hearts, which strives with all men.

2dly. That this does not preclude the necessity of a belief in all those things which are recorded in the holy Scriptures concerning the birth, life, miracles, &c. of Christ, by those who are favoured with a knowledge of the Scriptures; but that it is the indispensable duty of such to believe them, as their incredulity can only proceed from their resisting the Holy Spirit, which as minded would lead and incline every one to believe the same as they are offered to them.

Therefore when H. Barnard declares a belief in the truth of the account of the birth, miracles, &c. of Christ, to be non-essential to those who have a knowledge of the Scriptures, she is so far from coinciding with Barclay that she openly opposes him; and the distinction she makes between *doctrinal* truths and *historic* facts (a distinction that destroys the obligation of a belief in Christ's coming in the flesh, as a condition of Christian communion), has not the least connexion with the distinction between the *essence* and the *doctrines* of the Christian religion made by Barclay: for instead of weakening, he rather strengthens the obligations of a belief in the *peculiar doctrines* of the gospel by *professing* Christians.

Verax might with as much propriety have drawn a parallel between H. Barnard and T. Paine, as that which he has drawn between her and R. Barclay; for proof whereof I shall just mention an instance or two.

She advanced that though she could not assert her belief in the *positive and literal certainty* of the miracles of Christ, she fully believed in the power of God to effect those or any other miracles. Her reasons for suspending her belief in the miracles were, because they had not been revealed to her, and she was not *present* at the *time* they were *reported* to have been transacted: Thomas Paine could say as much as is here expressed, for he has fully acknowledged his belief in the divine omnipotence, though he rejects the Scripture miracles as impositions. The reason he gives for his disbelief in the resurrection of Christ is because he was not present, viz. 'Thomas would not believe it

'without having ocular demonstration, so neither will I.' And when H. B. was spoken to on this subject, her reply also was, 'Thou must consider me like Thomas, for I cannot believe it.' Her objections to the Jewish wars are so exactly correspondent with Paine's, that a reference to Watson's excellent 'Apology for the Bible' is a sufficient answer to them.—I do not wish to be understood as implying that there is no difference between her and T. Paine, by no means, but that her objections are more deistical than Christian: it is difficult to ascertain the extent of her doubts and disbelief, as she generally expressed her sentiments in vague, indefinite terms; still their sceptical tendency was sufficiently apparent.

I think enough has been advanced to convince thee that the perversions of the Friends' principles in the Appeal are so notorious, that they cannot be attributed to ignorance, but to design, in order to serve a party. The same want of candour and impartiality is discoverable in the author's account of the proceedings of the Society against H. B. as could be proved at large. It may suffice in this place to give a general outline of the proceedings of the Society, alluded to in thy Sketch, that thou mayst judge how far they really deserve the epithets of *persecution, prejudice, and passion*.

Hannah Barnard came over to England with the usual certificates from her respective meetings in America, recommending her to the Friends in Great Britain and Ireland, as a minister in unity with them. I am not certain of the time that elapsed before several began to suspect her soundness in the Christian faith as professed by the Friends; it is however certain, that dissatisfaction respecting her existed some time previous to the yearly meeting of 1800, and that *private advice* had been extended towards her; but possessing a mind, 'conceiving its place in the scale of intellect some degrees higher than the real one,' and 'impatient of controul,'* we are not to be surprised at H. B.'s rejecting the advice of her friends, when it might not accord with her conceptions of her own superior abilities; which state of mind, so opposite to that meekness and lowliness of heart inculcated by our blessed Redeemer, had been probably too much encouraged by the indiscreet applause of some individuals: if she had profited by the *private advice* of her friends, it would have prevented the necessity of pursuing measures so unpleasant in themselves, to which the Society was afterwards impelled in support of its primitive

* This is extracted from a character given her by one of her advocates; and which, from the knowledge I have of her, and of what she has written, I believe to be correct.

faith; also the consequent exposure of H. B. as one endeavouring to subvert the faith of the gospel.

I therefore reject as a gross calumny the charge contained in the Appeal, of a departure from the plainest principles of equity, justice, and gospel order, by the Society in the present instance; grounded upon the ill-founded supposition, that private admonition, which indeed forms the basis of Christian discipline, was not extended to H. B.

In the year 1800 she requested of the yearly meeting of ministers and elders the usual certificate, to enable her to accompany her companion Elizabeth Coggeshall in a visit to some parts of Germany: this request calling for a public acknowledgment of the unity of the Friends in England with her ministry; the propriety of granting such an acknowledgment was objected to by one of those who had privately, though unavailingly, admonished her—he objected because she was not of the same faith as the Society. An investigation into the truth of this charge was no more than justice to the individual, required of the meeting, though it is called in the Appeal an ‘exercise of inquisitorial authority.’—The result of which investigation confirmed the objection which had been made to the soundness of her Christian principles, in consequence of which she was *advised* to return home: but as she appeared determined to oppose the advice of the meeting, it referred the further attention to the case to the morning meeting of ministers and elders in London.—This was not a partial reference, but a general one of the whole case,* to the morning meeting; and it accordingly appointed a Committee to visit H. B. the result of which was only a still further discovery of the discordance between her sentiments and those of the Friends.

The morning meeting’s labour with, and advice to, H. B. being alike contemned by her, that meeting found itself obliged to refer her case to a monthly meeting. Notwithstanding this was a mode of proceeding pointed out by H. B. herself, and to which she informed them she had no objection; yet the Appeal abounds with pointed animadversion upon it, as a *novel* mode of proceeding, and inconsistent with the written rules of the Society. In a case so perfectly *novel* that there is no rule of the Society that fully applies to it, it would have been rather extraordinary if *no novelty* had attached to the proceedings of the Society respecting it: at the same time it will be difficult to prove these proceedings to have been *contrary* to the *existing* rules of the Society; which come next under our consideration.

* That is, this reference was intended to lead to an investigation of her various dissents in essential doctrines, and not confined to the subject of the Jewish wars.

The following rule was made in 1735, and is, I believe, the only one applicable to the case.

‘The morning meeting of ministers in London, and every other meeting of ministers, have a right, as they see meet in the wisdom of truth, to advise, exhort, and rebuke any of their members, or any who may travel in the work of the ministry, as occasion may require, without being accountable for the same to any monthly or quarterly meeting.’

‘But if any member of the said meetings, or any other minister, should at any time be overtaken with a fault, and the same be under the cognizance of the morning, or any other meeting of ministers, and the monthly meeting to which such person belongs shall also deal with him or her for the same; then, on notice from such monthly meeting, that they have taken the case under their care, all proceedings of the morning or other meeting of ministers against such minister or elder shall be finally stopped.’*

From the preceding extract it is evident, that the morning meeting is invested with a power to take cognizance of the improper conduct, not only of its own immediate members, but of any who may travel in the work of the ministry, by extending its rebuke and advice to such as it may see meet: and if a minister, in this situation, be dealt with by a monthly meeting, the rule must suppose a correspondence to have taken place between that meeting and the morning meeting, when it directs the monthly meeting to give notice to the morning meeting, that it has taken such a case under its care, in order that that meeting may stop any further proceedings in the case. The representation in the Appeal that the advice given by the morning meeting was equivalent to disowning H. Barnard as a minister, must be considered as mere chicanery by any one acquainted with our mode of drawing up disownments: the recommendation being written, did not alter the nature of the advice, the meeting being at full liberty to communicate it either in writing or verbally; if it had granted H. B.’s request by giving her a certificate of its unity with her ministry, such certificate would have been *written*.

With respect to the outcry raised in the Appeal against the overwhelming influence of the morning meeting, it should be considered, that H. B. had certificates from her own monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings in America, expressive of their unity with her as a minister; the influence of which certificates would have been too powerful, had she been opposed by a single

* This is followed by what is quoted in the Appeal, ‘Neither the morning meeting, nor any other meeting of ministers, have power to disown,’ &c.

individual, without the advice of the morning meeting (enjoined by the rules on such an occasion), having been first *unavailingly*, extended towards her, Verax points out no mode of proceeding to prevent these certificates, which always accompany travelling ministers, from having an undue influence, when the conduct of a minister so travelling, may require the public censure of the Society.

In the Appeal no material objection is made to the conduct of Devonshire House monthly meeting, to which the case of H. B. was referred by the morning meeting, excepting it be that their concluding minute did not repeat the charges against H. B. upon which its minute was founded, which was of no importance, as a copy of them had been delivered to H. B. in the report of the friends who visited her; which report fully justified the subsequent advice of the monthly meeting: the author of the Appeal is not correct when he says that that advice excluded part of the recommendation of the morning meeting; for can a meeting be said very carefully to exclude what it expresses its approbation of in the following terms, 'This meeting approves of the recommendation of the morning meeting of ministers and elders, and advises her to return home.'

We now come to the complaint that when H. B. appealed to the quarterly meeting against the *advice* of the monthly meeting, the quarterly meeting would not permit the case to be opened in the meeting at large: this will require a little further explanation than is given in the Appeal. The subject of Appeals generally relates to the immediate business of monthly, rather than of quarterly or yearly meetings, being occasioned by the dissatisfaction of some person or persons with the decision of a monthly meeting: the quarterly and yearly meetings therefore take no further cognizance of such business than is necessary to give reasonable satisfaction to the parties immediately concerned. The following account of H. B.'s case will pretty correctly describe the usual mode of proceeding, as it was not materially deviated from, except in her favour.

When she presented her appeal against the monthly meeting to the quarterly meeting, the meeting was informed that there was an appeal against Devonshire House monthly meeting, and the representatives of that meeting were asked whether they had any regular notice of the same; and upon its being answered in the affirmative, the meeting was proceeding in its usual way to appoint a committee out of the other monthly meetings to hear and judge of the said appeal: when an objection was started to any minister or elder being appointed on this committee, or even any person, who, accidentally attending Devonshire House monthly meeting, might have therein already expressed

a sentiment upon the subject of the appeal. This objection being as irregular as it was novel, was at first objected to on that account; the meeting being officially unacquainted either with the purport of the appeal, or even the name of the appellant, which is never made known to the meeting until the committee delivers in its report; with a view to prevent any improper bias in its appointment. But though officially unknown, the subject of this appeal being of too singular a nature not to be known to the greater part of the members present, as well as the name of the person by whom it was presented; the *irregularity* of the above objection was *waved* by the meeting, and a committee appointed, excluding those of the descriptions alluded to.

When the committee delivered in its report to the meeting, the appeal was read, and enquiry made whether both parties had been fully heard by the committee, which being answered in the affirmative, and neither party demanding a rehearing by the meeting itself, the report of the committee, as is usual in such cases, was read and confirmed: the meeting never entering into a discussion of the merits of appeals, unless requested by one of the parties concerned,* which neither did in the present instance.

The yearly meeting of 1801, conformably to its own rules of 1728 and 1733, appointed a committee of twelve friends, chosen out of twelve quarterly meetings, to hear and judge of any appeal that might *after* its *appointment* be presented to the meeting; the committee being annually appointed whether there be any business to come before it or not. When H. B.'s appeal was *afterwards* given in to the meeting, the meeting was informed of the name of the quarterly meeting against which the appeal lay, and understanding due notice had been given to the same quarterly meeting, it referred the consideration of it to the committee of appeals; and when it was afterwards informed that the appellant objected to the said committee on account of the stations held by some of its members in the Society, it was answered, that the committee being fairly chosen, agreeably to the established rules of the Society, no objection of that kind could be attended to in the *present stage* of the *business*:—but to do justice to the committee, it must be observed, that the members of the morning meeting which presented the charges against H. B. to Devonshire House monthly meeting, being also members of the quarterly meeting of London and Middlesex, they were of course excluded from the committee; but nevertheless, admitting that some of the committee might have been at the preceding yearly meet-

* Or unless there appears any ambiguity in the report of the committee on an Appeal.

ing of ministers and elders, and consequently not considered by H. B. as sufficiently unbiassed in judgment; the subsequent conduct of the yearly meeting should have prevented the violent clamours raised in the Appeal against its proceedings on this occasion. For when the committee brought in its report, in consequence of H. B.'s objection to the said report, as well as to the committee, the meeting itself considered her case, and patiently heard all that the appellant wished to lay before it in her defence, also what the respondents had to say in answer, until both declared they had nothing further to offer. When they withdrew, the meeting impartially considered the merits of what had been presented to it by each party, not allowing the members of the quarterly meeting of London and Middlesex, or any minister or elder present, from any part of the nation, to interfere in the deliberation; consequently the final judgment of the meeting was decided by those very members, from amongst whom H. B. was so earnest to have the committee of appeals chosen, and who unanimously, without one dissenting voice, expressed their approbation of the report of the committee; neither was this confined to a 'simply expressing their concurrence,' as stated in the Appeal; I recollect one friend in particular, who not only expressed his marked disapprobation of those tenets, which had that day found an advocate in H. B. but traced them to what appeared to him to be their source, as a caution to those then assembled. With respect to the restraint imposed on the members of London and Middlesex complained of by Verax, it was a restraint that the common principles of justice and impartiality required the meeting to impose, for upon what principle of equity could that quarterly meeting against which the appeal was presented, have been permitted to have a voice in the final deliberation of the yearly meeting upon the propriety of its own proceedings? it was doubtless this view of the subject that induced a Friend (not one of those round the table, but at the bottom of the meeting) to remark, in consequence of three or four London Friends insisting on their right to speak, that if the members of the quarterly meeting, which was the *respondent* in the present case, were permitted to speak, he should propose that the appellant be called in again—the propriety of which observation appeared to impress the meeting generally, except those three or four of H. B.'s party already alluded to; and who are magnified in different parts of the Appeal by the phrases, 'a number of Friends,' 'divers,' 'several other Friends,' with a view to lessen the appearance of that unanimity which really prevailed in the several meetings on this occasion. Perhaps it is because the attention of Verax was so absorbed by his sympathy for his three or four London Friends, that he has

been, to adopt his language, 'as silent as death, on another most prominent and important part of the proceeding in peremptorily enjoining strict silence on the *ministers and elders present*, 'and thereby precluding them from the usual privilege of speaking to subjects before the meeting, and that in a case on which, it is certain that some, and probably many of them, had never been allowed to speak before.'

The weakness of H. B.'s defence of her principles against the arguments advanced by the deputed respondent was too manifest to be denied; therefore it is represented in the Appeal that her friends advised her to leave the refutation of the respondent's speech to them: this is intended, I suppose, for an apology; but it cannot be said to be to the credit either of H. B. or her advocates; with respect to her, it implies a consciousness of inability to defend those principles which she declared it was her duty to promulgate, and this against one individual only, wherein a full opportunity was allowed of advancing every argument with which she might have furnished herself for the long-expected occasion, and that without any fear of being silenced, except by fair argument; with respect to her advocates, it certainly does not redound to their honour to preconcert a plan to deprive the delegated respondent of an opportunity either of explaining or vindicating his speech, by deferring any refutation of it, until he was withdrawn from the meeting, that they might advantageously attack it in his absence.* I attended all the sittings of the quarterly and yearly meetings when this subject came under their consideration, and in no case was I more fully convinced of 'an inflexible regard to justice and equity' and an 'anxious solicitude to do right' influencing the conduct of those meetings, so that I was surprised when informed that H. B.'s party intended to publish these proceedings, not being then aware of the resources misrepresentation would furnish it with, to give what colouring it pleased to the principles, as well as the conduct of the Society.

If the author of the Appeal were *really sincere*, when he professed a reluctance in recording these proceedings, and that it was an unpleasant task to him to point out what he calls the errors and inconsistencies of his brethren, instead of exaggerating them, he would have honourably embraced every opportunity of lessening the force of those censures, he has bestowed on the Society. And then, perhaps, we should have been informed, that the meeting for sufferings (a standing committee of the yearly meeting), unwilling to deprive Hannah Barnard of any claim, that her situation as a stranger gave her upon the So

* We are not therefore to be surprised at the chagrin manifested by the author of the Appeal on account of this disappointment.

ciety, not inconsistent with a Christian zeal for its faith, offered to defray the expences of her passage back to America, which offer, though rejected by her, evinced that however the Friends might be under the influence of *prejudice* (if preferring their ancient religious opinions to the *new* ones propagated by H. B. can be so termed), they were at least free from *passion*, or the antichristian spirit of *persecution*.

H. Barnard, when in England, pretended she had openly propagated those sentiments in America, which had subjected her to censure here. The truth of this may be determined by the event. Upon her return to her own country, she was, for her *newly professed* sentiments, silenced as a minister *in unity with Friends*, and her subsequent conduct obliged them to disown her as a member of our Society.

It may be also observed that there is no credit to be given to the account in the Appeal of the conversations that passed between H. B. and the committees; they having been misrepresented both by omissions and additions in those instances, respecting which I have been able to procure information—whether these inaccuracies are unintentional, or with design, I leave; but Verax having, in his extracts from the Friends' writings, and comments upon them, mutilated and perverted their meaning, to make them suit his own purposes; when he could be so easily detected by any who would take the trouble of looking into the works themselves referred to by him,* we may form an idea what reliance is to be placed on his verbal evidence.

To return to the Sketch—thou expressest a hope that the Quakers 'will return to that perfect freedom of sentiment which constitutes the glory of unadulterated Christianity.'† Though it is possible thou and the Quakers may vary in your definition of these two last words; yet, I think, ere this, thou must be convinced that they have not swerved either from the tenets they originally professed, or from allowing that freedom of sentiment to other societies or individuals, which they take to themselves; for with respect to the case of H. B. which drew the above remark from thee—the question is not, Whether she should enjoy liberty of conscience to propagate what appears to her, 'pure unmixed truth freed from ancient and modern corruptions?' for only a spirit of persecution could wish to deprive her of it: but whether it be consistent

* And which misquotations have been pointed out by Vindex, also in a publication entitled, 'Some Tracts relating to the Controversy between Hannah Barnard and the Society of Friends.' These pieces, together with one by Henry Tuke, entitled, 'The Faith of the People called Quakers in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,' will give sufficient information of the faith of the Friends to satisfy a candid reader.

† Sketch, 7th Edit. p. 156, Note.

for H. B. whilst professing herself to be a minister of the Society of Friends to propagate sentiments that tend to the subversion of their principles. I now appeal to thee as a professed Christian minister, if a society can be charged with 'the most distant resemblance to persecution,' for publicly opposing such conduct, after private labour to reclaim had been extended unavailingly; or rather, if it had not so done, whether it would not have manifested a want of proper zeal 'in support of what appeared to it to be the interests of truth.'

My apology for thus intruding upon thy patience, is the duty I owe to the Society of Friends, as a member of it; and also because thy judgment appears to have been biased by a perusal of the Appeal, at which I am not surprised; the dissingenuous manner in which that work is penned, is sufficient to mislead those who view the sentiments and conduct of the Society only through its medium. And when we consider the variety of matter comprised in thy Sketch, that thou shouldst fall into inadvertent errors, through misinformation, is not to be wondered at, but I trust thou wilt preserve thy reputation for impartiality, by adopting some means to remove the injurious impression thy Sketch may have made upon the public, by ingenuously acknowledging the errors thou hast been led into; and by giving a correct account of the real sentiments of the Friends, who must at present consider themselves as unjustly represented, and in a work, the extensive circulation of which may not confine the injustice done them within a narrow circle; whereas the 'Appeal,' a pamphlet to which thou hast referred thy readers, written by some anonymous individual, might otherwise have fallen into the obscurity it merits. If thou wert to arrange anew thy account of the Friends, I think it might be comprised in a less compass. If thou shouldst desire any assistance towards such an arrangement, thou wilt find one always disposed to give it as far as it is in his power, in

Thy sincere Friend,

JOHN BEVANS, JUN.

P. S. I have herewith sent thee *The Faith of the People called Quakers*, by Henry Tuke; *An Examination of the first part of the Appeal*, by Vindex; and *Some Tracts relating to the Controversy between Hannah Barnard and the Society of Friends*, published by Christicola.

*Some Strictures on the Eighth and Ninth Editions
of 'A Sketch of the Denominations of the
'Christian World,' by JOHN EVANS.*

I. A PARTIAL statement of the truth, especially if it be attended with an appearance of liberality and candour, is often more injurious in its effects, than a direct and palpable mis-statement, the latter generally defeating its own end. I am sorry to have to apply such a remark to the *Sketch*: this work, instead of giving a clear and just view of the tenets of the Society of Friends, involves them in an apparent contradiction and obscurity, under the guise of impartial extracts from their writings. Charity inclined me at first to attribute this rather to inadvertence or misinformation, than to any premeditated design; but a continued repetition of it in the subsequent editions of the *Sketch*, made me suspect that the author was influenced by motives incompatible with the professions in his preface and dedication, and this suspicion has been since confirmed by a more strict investigation of other parts of his work.

The remarks in the preceding letter applied to the 7th edition of the *Sketch*; the 8th and 9th editions have since made their appearance: it is to them these strictures are intended immediately to apply. They are not entirely confined to J. E.'s account of the Quakers, but extended to other parts of the *Sketch*, in which we may discover the secret springs of his prejudice against them.

II. He continues to assert that 'Barclay, in his Confession and Catechism, used only the words of Scripture' respecting the Resurrection of the Body and the Divinity of Christ, 'without expressing the manner in which he understood them.'* That Barclay has used the words of Scripture in the answers to the questions in his Catechism is true, and that his Confession of Faith is drawn up in Scripture language is not denied, but the assertion that Barclay has not expressed the manner in which he understood them, I reject as incorrect: if the intelligent reader peruse the first, third, and fourth chapters of the Catechism; the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh articles of the Confession of Faith; and the seventeenth chapter that immediately follows the

* *Sketch*, p. 160.

Confession; he will be convinced of the disingenuity of J. E. in stigmatizing Barclay with screening himself under Scripture phraseology, so as to veil his sentiments in obscurity. And even conceding that, from the plan of the work, Barclay had not expressed himself with his usual perspicuity in his Catechism, the extract from his Apology, cited in the preceding letter, p. 4, is sufficient to remove the charge of intentional ambiguity, an acknowledgment of which was the least that equity and generosity demanded of John Evans.—He has also repeated his assertion that ‘no writer of acknowledged reputation among them (the Friends), has admitted any distinction of persons in the deity:’* this is true as far as it goes, but it is ‘a part of the truth only;’ hence calculated to mislead. Why does he not add, that though they reject the school terms, ‘distinct and separate persons,’ because in their apprehension conveying ideas too gross, they believe in a Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that these three are one God? has he herein manifested equal candour with A. Rees, whose description of the Quakers, in his edition of Chambers’s Cyclopædia ‘does honour to his impartiality?’

III. Having rejected Barclay as ambiguous in his account of the Divinity of Christ, J. E. introduces William Penn as being more explicit on the subject. This enemy to ambiguity is however so unfortunate as to stumble upon the title of a controversial tract of Penn’s, that has not a word in it either for or against the Divinity of Christ; neither was the tract intended to elucidate that subject, if we are to believe its author, who, upon being charged by his opponents, with having, in that work, denied the eternal Deity of Christ, accuses them with ‘supposing what he never thought, much less writ of.’† The treatise of Richard Claridge, to which we are referred by J. E. as ‘a learned defence’ of Penn’s ‘Sandy Foundation Shaken,’ was written in reply to F. Bugg, who endeavoured to put the same construction upon that publication of Penn’s, as Verax has done; its import may be clearly seen by the extracts from it in the preceding letter, and the following pages. Our attention is next called to Penn’s vindication of himself in his ‘Innocency with her open face.’ Passing over unnoticed the arguments advanced in defence of the Divinity of Christ, J. E. hastens to the character of Socinus, of whom Penn seems to have entertained a favourable opinion, from his having abandoned the pleasures and honours of a court for conscience sake. This charitable view of the character of Socinus may be gratifying to those who adopt the opinions that are distinguished by his name, but it leaves the reader where it found him as to Penn’s

* Sketch, p. 160.

† Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 268.

religious sentiments. This citation being however given as illustrative of his opinions, must it not have been intended to impress the reader with an idea that Penn and Socinus had the same views respecting the nature of Christ? whereas Penn has sufficiently cleared himself from any imputation of this kind by those observations, which, as I have just hinted, are concealed from the view of his readers by J. E. who, however, ventures at last to give us an extract rather more descriptive of Penn's opinions. Still the whole of his quotations are such as to cast that writer's tenets into some incongruity and apparent inconsistency: and this account of his, he pronounces to be 'an explicit declaration of the principles of Quakerism.' If it were so, there might indeed be some ground for his subsequent remark that 'there seems to be a much greater uniformity in their dress than in their opinions.' In this, however, I also dissent from him.

IV. If John Evans had 'no interest to promote but that of truth,' why refuse to insert the extract from Penn's 'Key to the Quakers' Religion and Perversions of it,' quoted in my letter, page 5, instead of the title of his 'Sandy Foundation Shaken?' It is written by the same author, expressed more clearly, and consequently less liable to misconstruction. If truth were really his only object, why refuse to insert the passage proposed to him, from Penn's 'Innocency with her open Face,' in page 7, instead of that containing the character of Socinus? He *cannot* deny it to be '*more explicit on the subject,*' than the latter. What emptiness in professions!

V. The observations in my letter being confined to a particular branch of the account of the Quakers in the Sketch, I afterwards examined the whole of the article, and shewed how, without enlarging it, other branches of their doctrine might be more clearly expressed. In this draft I introduced the case of Hannah Barnard, not because I deemed it sorting with the nature of the work, but as J. E. had himself so far deviated from his plan, to afford an opportunity for censuring the Friends for their conduct towards her; justice seemed to require the reparation to be as public as the injury. This last communication met with a reception similar to the first.

There is no doubt that J. E. may have felt interested for H. B. by discovering, through a personal knowledge of her, *some* similarity between their religious opinions: but is the character of a Society to be sacrificed to private opinions and acquaintance?

VI. In the 7th Edition of the Sketch, page 155, is the following Note, adverting to the proceedings of the Friends against H. Barnard.

'We are extremely sorry to perceive such proceedings amongst a body hitherto distinguished for their love of toleration. We

‘used to think the Quakers abhorred every thing which bore the most distant resemblance to persecution, and we still indulge the hope, that laying aside all prejudice and passion, they will return to that perfect freedom of sentiment which constitutes the glory of unadulterated Christianity’

It is the charge contained in this note that is adverted to in my letter to the author, who, in his 8th Edition, inserts the following instead of it.

‘The author has omitted a *Note* in the last edition, expressive of his concern for the proceedings of the Society against Hannah Barnard, because it subjected him to the imputation of partiality. But he thinks it incumbent on him to declare that he still continues as much as ever the enemy of *intolerance*, under whatever form it may please to impose itself on the religious world.’*

This is also inserted in the 9th edition, omitting the words ‘in the last edition.’ If the former note subjected its author to the imputation of partiality, it is impossible for the present one to remove that imputation. With regard to the justice of the censure conveyed by it, I trust the preceding and following pages will determine the point.

In the 8th and 9th Edition, page 166, the reader is referred to two treatises, as though they were written by the Friends, one by William Matthews, the other by John Hancock: is this compatible with liberality or candour? for J. E. knew them not to be members of the Society, but that their works were written in opposition to it.

VII. In the preface to the 8th and 9th Editions are these words ‘In the present impression he has attended carefully to recent communications, and where individuals have sent confused and contradictory accounts of their own party, he has endeavoured to adjust their claims with impartiality.’ It must be left with an impartial public to determine, whether, if these endeavours were made, they have been crowned with success. J. E. may have received some account of the Friends, and of their conduct towards H. B. from two or three disaffected or *ci-devant* members, but if he has, he was not ignorant who they were; he could not therefore mistake any thing he might receive from such a quarter, as coming from, or on behalf of, the Society.

‘That I may not appear to countenance, by my conduct, what I condemn with my pen, by withholding any part of the truth, I readily acknowledge that J. E. has given a pretty correct description of the origin of the Friends in their own words; nor until he comes to their sentiments respecting Christ, is

candour expelled by prejudice, but *then* he would willingly give their opinions a Socinian cast, and indirectly represents their opposition to the disseminating of Socinian tenets by one of their ministers, as *intolerance imposed on the religious world* under some new form.

VIII. An attachment to the Socinian cause may be perceived in various parts of the Sketch; not that it is advocated openly—the nature of the work would not admit of it, but indirectly, by a repeated, and sometimes a recommendatory reference to Socinian writers, and sometimes also to the prejudice of other religious communities.

Under a description of the tenets of the Socinians, we expect, of course, to find a reference to their writers, and Belsham, as being one, is very properly adverted to: but J. E. cannot be said to have complimented his reader's memory by introducing Belsham's reply to Wilberforce, under the head of Methodists, after it had been repeatedly mentioned, and extracts from it before inserted. He has not shown the same consideration for his reader respecting *Fuller* and *Wilberforce*, the opponents of *Belsham*; we are not even indulged with a single extract from either of their works.

The recommendation to the reader, when describing the tenets of the Calvinists, to consult the 'Universal Theological Magazine,'* to know how they 'have expressed themselves on the death of Christ,'† cannot be more suitably animadverted on than by the following question: What would John Evans think of the candour of the man, who, in a work like the *Sketch*, under the articles Socinians and Universalists, should refer his reader to 'The Theological and Biblical Magazine,'‡ for a correct account of their tenets?

When J. E. mentions A. Fuller's work, entitled '*The Calvinistic and Socinian Systems examined and compared* as to their moral tendency,' he only gives so much of the title as is distinguished by italic, but does not neglect to subjoin in a note. Belsham mentions it, in his reply to Wilberforce, with great contempt. He there remarks, that the amount of its boasted argument is this—"We, Calvinists being *much better Christians* than you Socinians, our doctrines *must* be true!"|| Is not this adapted to impress the reader with an idea that Fuller's work is more dogmatical than argumentative? at least, it had this effect upon me; but by reading Fuller's publication, I saw I had been misled, and was convinced that it was much easier for Belsham to affect to treat it with contempt, than to refute it.

J. E. describing the Trinitarians, adopts Priestley's division of

* The Unitarian and Universalist's Magazine.

† Sketch, p. 71. ‡ A Calvinistic Magazine. || Sketch, p. 71, 72.

them into two classes, viz. 'those who believe that there is no proper Divinity in Christ, besides that of the Father; and the class of Tritheists, who maintain that there are three equal and distinct Gods.* Is the Socinian a fit character to delineate the opinions of the Trinitarian? Can J. E. name any Trinitarian society that believes in three equal and distinct Gods?

IX. I shall conclude these strictures with J. E.'s description of the Arminians' view of what are termed the *five points*. In the first point, where it mentions that those who continue finally impenitent, will be consigned to 'everlasting punishment,' he expunges the word *everlasting*, because inimical to the Universalists' scheme, and he thus expresses the Arminians' belief in the third and fourth points.

3d. 'That mankind are not totally depraved, and that depravity does not come upon them by virtue of Adam's being their public head, but that mortality and natural evil only are the direct consequences of his sin to posterity.'

4th. 'That there is no such thing as irresistible grace, in the conversion of sinners.†

From whatever source J. E. has derived his statement of these two propositions, the former does not accord with any account I have seen of it, whether given by the enemies or friends of the Arminians, neither is it the same with what was publicly taught by the Remonstrants in Holland, or with what is now taught by the Wesleyan or Arminian Methodists and the Quakers or Friends; of whose belief, the latter also is but a mere skeleton or shadow. The following are the third and fourth points as professed by them.

3d. 'That true faith cannot proceed from the exercise of our natural faculties and powers, nor from the force of operation of free will; since man, in consequence of his natural corruption, is incapable either of thinking, or doing any good thing; and that therefore it is necessary to his conversion and salvation, that he be regenerated and renewed by the operation of the holy Ghost, which is the gift of God, through Jesus Christ.'

4th. 'That this Divine grace, or energy of the holy Ghost, which heals the disorder of a corrupt nature, begins, advances, and brings to perfection every thing that can be called good in man, and that consequently all good works, without exception, are to be attributed to God alone, and to the operation of his grace; that, nevertheless, this grace does not force the man to act against his inclination, but may be resisted and

* Sketch, p. 47.

† Ibid. p. 75.

rendered ineffectual by the perverse will of the impenitent sinner.'

For a true account, not only of these, but of the rest of the *five points*, as professed by the Arminians or Remonstrants, see *Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History*, and *Brandt's History of the Reformation in the Low Countries*.

We will not refuse to J. Evans the merit at least of consistency in his conduct, by rejecting the true statement of these two articles. But what can apologize for his thus obliquely confounding the Socinians and Arminians with each other? after this, it would be a reflection upon the good sense of the reader to suppose it needful further to enlarge, to convince him that the Sketch is evidently devoted to the cause of the Socinians and Universalists. Hence also we must not be surprised at the poor Quakers falling under its censure, for daring to think for themselves in opposition to the party it espouses. I must confess that this discovery of the dissingenuity of J. E. occasioned some disappointment, as my hopes of a work that promised to be useful and interesting, were thereby frustrated; for it would indeed have been of public utility, if it had brought 'Christians of different denominations to a more just knowledge of each other's tenets,' and proved 'the means of inclining them the more cheerfully to exercise towards one another that charity which thinketh no evil,' by divesting 'the several denominations of the extraneous matter which had been attached to them, either through ignorance or malignity, and thus holding them up to the view of the reader in their just and regular proportions.'* But to effect these desirable objects a work still appears to be wanting.

* Sketch. p. xxii. xxvi.

CHAP. II.

Remarks on the state of the controversy—Of WILLIAM PENN'S sentiments respecting the Trinity, and the Divinity of Christ, and respecting the state of man in the fall.

THE Reader will have observed in the preceding chapter, that our early Friends refused to adopt the phrase of *distinct and separate persons*, when speaking of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, whom they believed to be one God inseparably united, agreeably to the words of Christ, 'He that hath seen me hath 'seen the Father also.' This subjected them to the attacks of their enemies, as deniers of the Trinity, and of the Divinity of Christ; which attacks, although they were constantly repelled by them as unfounded, are now renewed, but with this difference—our early opponents were mostly Trinitarians, our present, Socinians. The diversity in their characters, makes the charge assume a novel appearance; and on this account, more than from the cogency of the reasoning of our antagonists, it requires to be repelled.

Several writers have appeared on this occasion; but it is to the refutation of the publications of Verax, the following pages will be principally devoted; in the course of which, I purpose clearly to prove that those parts of his pamphlets, which lie open to investigation, are founded upon conclusions drawn from false premises. His desultory observations and reflections on the Friends, he will, in general, be permitted quietly to enjoy.

The purport of the Appeal, if I understand it, is to prove our first Friends to be strict Unitarians, 'in the proper sense of 'the word as it is now understood,' and that their sentiments respecting the Scriptures were similar to those for which Hannah Barnard was silenced as a minister; also, that they did not attach sufficient importance to an union of sentiment on these

points, to authorize the late proceedings of our Society against her. In controverting these positions, I shall, with but little variation, follow the order adopted by Verax.

As there is scarcely a more fruitful source of mistake than the use of expressions to which very different ideas may be annexed, we must first define the present general acceptation of the word *Unitarian*, before we can determine the propriety of applying it to our early Friends. *Unitarian* is a name by which the modern Socinians have chosen to distinguish themselves from other religious societies, and is therefore strictly speaking, only appropriate to one who adopts their tenets. Verax, in his *Vindication* of the *Appeal* against the *Examination* of the first part of that work by *Vindex*, in reply to an observation of the latter, that the *Appeal* appears to him ‘intended to prove that ‘our early Friends were what are now called Unitarians,’ &c. says, ‘That I consider our early Friends to have been generally ‘*Unitarians*, I readily admit;—they were, no doubt, as even ‘*Vindex* allows William Penn to have been, at all times, “deeply impressed with the importance of holding up the “doctrine of the complete unity of the Deity.” The consistent ‘acknowledgment, and reverent belief, of this truly scriptural ‘and primitive doctrine, is *pure and simple Unitarianism*. It is in ‘this sense only I have used the phrase, as descriptive of the ‘sentiments of our early Friends.’*

Thus Verax recedes from his former bold assertion that W. Penn must be considered in the proper sense of ‘the word as ‘it is now understood, a strict Unitarian,’† and gives a pure and simple sense of the word, instead of that in which it is commonly accepted. If he applied this name to our Friends, not in the common, but in a pure and simple sense, he should have been more explicit in his definition of it, and not have given one which may be acceded to by persons of very opposite tenets. Passing over his new definition of the import of *Unitarian*, let us examine into its present meaning, or in other words, into the tenets of the modern Socinians.

1st. They reject the doctrine of the Trinity, or that the Father, Son, and Spirit are ‘one living and true God everlasting, of one substance, power, and eternity,’ but believe the Son to be a separate Being from God, consequently not God.

2d. They believe Christ to be a mere man, the son of Joseph and Mary, and that the accounts given of his birth in the gospels are false.

3d. They believe that mankind have not suffered such a moral change in consequence of the fall of Adam, as to require

* ‘Vindication of Scriptural Unitarianism,’ &c. by Verax, p. iv.

† *Appeal*, p. 7.

any immediate divine influence on the soul to enable man to do the will of God ; but that human reason is sufficient to guide man into the paths of virtue and happiness.

4th. They disbelieve the immateriality of the soul, supposing it to be as mortal as the body, that is, that it loses all conscious existence until the resurrection of the body at the last day.

5th. They deny the freedom of human actions, believing in what they term philosophical necessity, by which men are impelled to virtue and vice by irresistible motives.

Although I believe there are few of the professed advocates of the Socinian cause, who do not maintain the whole of the above five articles ; yet if we only include in our consideration the three first, as being more peculiarly the leading features of Socinianism ; they will suffice to show that Verax has entirely failed in his proofs of the Unitarianism of our first Friends. It was probably from a conviction of the ‘ considerable ambiguity ’ in which these proofs were involved, that he was induced to shift his ground, and present us with a pure and simple Unitarianism of his own. Would it not have been more ingenuous to have acknowledged that by a further investigation of the Friends’ writings, so much additional light had been thrown upon their sentiments as to convince him that he had been mistaken respecting them ; but from those who have some ‘ other interest to promote ’ besides ‘ that of truth,’ we are not to expect such a self-denial to literary fame.

Before the conclusions of Verax can be admitted as the evident result of his premises, he must establish the truth of the following inconsequent and contradictory deductions.

1st. That because the Friends object to use the phrase ‘ distinct and separate persons,’ when speaking of the Trinity, they cannot believe in the Trinity ; notwithstanding it is a consequence they have always refused to admit.

2d. Because they believed that ‘ there is but one living and ‘ true God ; and in unity of this Godhead, there be three—‘ of one substance, power, and eternity ; the Father, Son, and ‘ the holy Ghost ;’* they must have considered the Son as a distinct substance and being from God, and this, when they professed to believe in his ‘ Eternal Divinity.’

3d. That they did not believe that the Son of God became man, or took upon him the human nature for the salvation of mankind ; although they declared Christ to be ‘ God uncreated, ‘ and Man conceived by the holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin ‘ Mary,† also that they believed him ‘ to be really both true ‘ God and true man.’‡

* Article 1st of Church of England.

† Claridge’s Life and Works, p. 442. ‡ Barclay’s Works, p. 794.

Such are the inconsistencies Verax has to encounter, before he can establish his proofs of the Unitarianism of our first Friends. He likewise confounds, what has always appeared to me as two distinct articles of faith.

1st. The Trinity. 2d. That Christ was and is God and man. A belief in one is certainly generally accompanied with a belief in the other, but this does not necessarily follow; for admitting that Verax had made good his position, that the Friends, by rejecting the school terms in their explications of the Trinity, rejected the doctrine itself, the consequence he has drawn from it, viz. that they could not believe in the Divinity of Christ,* will not therefore necessarily follow. They however not only believed in the Trinity, notwithstanding their objections to the metaphysical terms of the schools, but they also have in the most undisguised terms expressed their belief in the Divinity of Christ. As to the insinuation of Verax, that ‘there is considerable ambiguity in their writings,’ and ‘that on the subject of Christ, they sheltered themselves behind the broad shield of allegory; and thus did not discriminate between Christ as a person, and Christ as a principle.’† I reject it as false, and inconsistent with that ‘manly boldness,’ wherewith, as he elsewhere says, they avowed their sentiments. That the strong evidence with which Verax has been confronted, should have impelled him to have recourse to these evasions, and endeavour to shelter himself *behind the broad shield of allegory*, is not surprising. Our early Friends were under no necessity to resort to such artifices—they were above them. They believed Christ, without any mental reserves, to be their God and Redeemer, as their devotional as well as their controversial writings clearly prove, in which they also distinguish between the Godhead and manhood of Christ, but they have not separated them into two Christs, as Verax has endeavoured to do by his ‘broad shield of allegory.’

That our Friends now believe, and always have believed, in only one God, will not be attempted to be denied. Do not all Christians profess to believe only one God? but do they therefore deny Christ to be God? Finally, if Verax includes in his complete unity of the Deity, the Son and the Holy Spirit, not only our Friends, but other Trinitarians, will equally claim the appellation of Unitarians; but it being evident from the whole scope of his reasoning, that he does not simply use it as implying a belief in one God, but as also rejecting the Divinity of

* I may here observe, that whenever I adopt this expression, it is to be understood in its strict and proper sense.

† Vindication, p. v.

Christ: I reject the term in the sense intended by him, as not appropriate either to our ancient or modern Friends.

I conceived it necessary to make these preliminary remarks, that we might not rush into the controversy without the reader's understanding the subject respecting which we contend. It now remains for us to examine whether the writings of our Friends will substantiate my remarks, or the conclusions drawn from them by Verax: and as William Penn leads the van of his evidence to support Socinianism, we will begin with him.

Some notice has been taken of the sentiments of William Penn in the preceding letter, let us however examine further into the nature of the controversy between him in conjunction with George Whitehead, and Thomas Vincent, Wm. Maddox, &c. which gave rise to 'The Sandy Foundation Shaken,' and its Apology entitled, 'Innocency with her open Face.' This may be obtained from the former of these tracts, in which Penn gives a short confutation by way of recapitulation of what was objected against him and Geo. Whitehead by T. Vincent, and three of his brethren, as follows:

'The question was this, Whether we owned one Godhead, 'subsisting in three distinct and separate persons;—which being 'denied by us, as a doctrine no where scriptural, T. V. frames 'this syllogism from the beloved disciple's words, "There are "three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, "and the Holy Ghost, and these three are one." 'These are 'either three manifestations, three operations, three substances, 'or three somethings else besides subsistences; but they are 'not three manifestations, &c. ergo, three subsistences. G. W. utterly rejected his terms as not to be found in scripture, nor deducible from the place he instanced: wherefore he desires their explanation of their terms, inasmuch as God did not use to wrap his truths up in heathenish metaphysics, but in plain language: notwithstanding we could not obtain a better explication, than person, or of person, than the mode of a substance; to all which G. W. and myself urged several scriptures, proving God's complete unity.' And controverting T. V.'s minor proposition he says, 'No one 'substance can have three distinct subsistences, and preserve its 'unity: for granting them the most favourable definition, 'every subsistence must have its own substance; so that three 'distinct subsistences or manners of being will require three 'distinct substances or beings, consequently three Gods.*' Although in opposing T. Vincent's syllogism, Penn may have adopted expressions which might bear an interpretation never intended by him, he endeavours to prevent any misconstruction

* Penn's Works, Fol. Edit. Vol. I. p. 251.

of that kind by the caution already cited in page 5, of ‘ Mis-
 ‘ take me not, we have never disowned a Father, Word, and
 ‘ Spirit, &c.’ hence we may see that it was the metaphysical
 terms adopted by the schoolmen in explaining the Trinity, as
 verging towards Tritheism or three Gods, and not the mystery
 itself, against which Penn’s arguments were directed. This is
 further confirmed by G. Whitehead’s vindication of himself,
 and W. Penn, in a Treatise, dated 1669, entitled, ‘ *The Divi-
 ‘ nity of Christ, and Unity of the Three that bear record in heaven,
 ‘ with the blessed end and effects of Christ’s Appearance, coming in
 ‘ the flesh, suffering and sacrifice for sinners confessed and vindicated
 ‘ by his followers called Quakers.*’ He therein states the objection
 of W. Maddox, one of T. Vincent’s coadjutors, as follows :
 ‘ You, by refusing to call them the Three Divine Hees, have made
 ‘ it manifest, that your quarrel is not with the word person, as some
 ‘ then apprehended ; but with the doctrine or fundamental truth,
 ‘ expressed by the three persons, viz. the modal distinction, and essential
 ‘ union, or oneness of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.’ To which
 objection G. Whitehead answers, ‘ It is manifest that some of
 ‘ the hearers that were present at our debating this matter, had
 ‘ a better apprehension and understanding of us than you pre-
 ‘ judiced opposers had : for some of them apprehended that
 ‘ we opposed your unscriptural terms and words put upon the
 ‘ Deity, and not that we opposed either the Divinity or union
 ‘ of Father, Son, or Holy Ghost ; neither did we in the least go
 ‘ to quarrel with any fundamental truth.—Yea, and it was
 ‘ evident to many, that we found fault with your miscalling and
 ‘ misrepresenting the Father, the Word, and Spirit ; and never
 ‘ in the least opposed nor questioned their being three such as
 ‘ mentioned in the Scripture, viz. the Father, Son, and Holy
 ‘ Ghost ; but there openly confessed to the fundamental truth of
 ‘ them in scripture terms.’*

George Whitehead here gives the same explication of the
 nature of the dispute between himself and William Penn on
 the one part, and T. Vincent, W. Maddox, &c. on the other
 part ; as R. Claridge does in his vindication of Penn. It is
 likewise to be observed, that although W. Penn and the Socinian
 both object to the Athanasian creed, there is this material dif-
 ference between them: the latter entirely rejects the doctrine
 that creed attempts to explain; the former admits the doctrine,
 but rejects the explanation as not scriptural: one believes the
 Son to be a distinct and separate Being from God, and not an
 object of divine worship; the other believes the Son to be
 truly and properly God, but objects to the scholastic terms, as
 making a greater distinction between the Father, Son, and

Holy Spirit, than is authorized by the Scriptures, which describe them as one God

Are we to be surprised that Verax thinks W. Penn's opponents were justified in supposing that he had, in his 'Sandy Foundation shaken,' denied the eternal Deity of Christ, as being 'grounded on the obvious Unitarian tendency of the 'whole work,'* since he has himself preferred a similar charge against the whole of Penn's works? I know he has endeavoured to modify this charge in his *Vindication of the Appeal*, by saying that he has never asserted that the Friends denied "the eternal 'Divinity of Christ,'" in the sense in which they 'used those 'terms,' but that 'it must have been their intention to ascribe 'supreme Divinity to God the Father only, the uncreated cause of 'all things.'† If they believed Christ to be 'God uncreated,'‡ must they not have believed him to be *the uncreated cause of all things*? Is not the first phrase as scriptural as the last? if they did not believe Christ 'to be really both true God and true man,' what sophistry can justify their expressions? well may we say, 'In what a labyrinth of nonsense does a man involve himself, 'who labours to maintain falsehood by argument!'

If W. Penn had not thought very differently from Verax, of the charges of his opponents, would he have considered their accusation a calumny, and published his 'Innocency with her 'open face,' to defend his 'Sandy Foundation shaken' against their attacks? The nature of which attacks it is necessary to ascertain, to have a clear conception of the import of Penn's apology for himself: his enemies did not accuse him of denying the 'Divinity of Christ's mission, and his doctrine as a 'prophet, and teacher sent from God;' neither did they accuse him of denying the Eternity and Godhead of the Father—No: they charged him with being a Socinian, with denying Christ to be God; this will appear by the following vindication of him by George Whitehead.

'And as for his (T. Vincent's) railing against W. Penn, and 'accusing him with denying that the Lord Jesus Christ is 'God, and with denying the Divinity of Christ and Holy Ghost, 'and with thrusting the Lord Jesus Christ off from the throne 'of his Godhead, &c. I have not yet perceived any strength or 'weight of argument from either T. V. or his brethren, that has 'convicted W. P. as guilty herein; his shewing the absurdity of 'T. V.'s doctrines, and both unscriptural and unreasonable distinctions, and his denial thereof, is neither a denial of the Son,

* 'Vindication,' p. 8. † Ibid. p. iv, v.

‡ Verax, in his *Vindication*. p. 75, objects to the phrase *uncreated*, when used by R. Claridge, as not a Scripture term, although he has adopted the same word himself when speaking of the Deity!!!

' nor Spirit, nor the Divinity of either, but the apparent falseness
 ' of these railing accusations, with the consequences thereof
 ' against W. P. in this thing touching the Divinity of Christ, &c.
 ' appears in his own book, page 14, "Of Christ being the only
 " God, and the Divine nature being inseparable to each (whom
 " they call) person, each person having the whole Divine nature,
 " the Son in the Father, and the Spirit in the Son, unless the
 " Godhead be incommunicable to the person (so called), as they
 " are reported to be among themselves," saith W. P. Doth not
 ' W. P. herein own the Divinity of Christ and Holy Spirit.
 ' Let the indifferent judge how T. V. has wronged him; and
 ' then W. P.'s Admonition, page 15, saith, "Apply thy mind
 " unto the light and grace which brings salvation; that by obe-
 " dience thereunto, those mists, tradition hath cast before thy
 " eyes, may be expelled, and thou receive a certain knowledge
 " of that one God, whom to know is life eternal, not to be
 " divided, but ONE pure, entire, and eternal Being; who, in
 " the fulness of time, sent forth his Son, as the true light
 " which enlighteneth every man, that whosoever followed him
 " (the Light), might be translated from the dark notions and
 " vain conversations of men, to this holy Light, in which only
 " found judgment and eternal life are obtainable, (he) testified
 " the virtue of it, and has communicated unto all such a pro-
 " portion as may enable them to follow his example." [Thus far
 ' W. P.] Now mark, whether herein he has not owned the Di-
 ' vinity of the Son, when thus plainly he hath confessed to his
 ' light, both as to its extent and virtue.' And after complaining
 of T. V.'s falsely comparing W. Penn to Arius, G. Whitehead
 proceeds, 'But further, how evidently has W. P. in his 18,
 ' 19, 21, pages owned and confessed Christ the Son of God,
 ' and his light and grace, both for remission of sins, reconcili-
 ' ation, salvation of men, life eternal; and as he is the only-
 ' begotten of the Father, the gift and expression of eternal love
 ' for salvation. Now can any thing have or work these effects
 ' that is not divine? Is not Christ's Divinity, virtue, divine
 ' light, and power, plainly confessed by W. P. herein, as also to his
 ' being God, page 21. How grossly have these Presbyterians,
 ' wronged him, in charging the contrary upon him, and are
 ' not they rather justly chargeable herein, with denying the
 ' Divinity of Christ in setting so slight by his light in every
 ' man, as they have done, one calling it an idol, another
 ' cautioning not to follow its guidance; but the Divinity of
 ' Christ, and the honour due to him, far be it from us to
 ' deny, as these men have done, and the Scripture instances
 ' in that case, we both know and own, John iii. 13. viii. 58.
 ' Rom. ix. 5. Phil. ii. 6. 10. Col. i. 16, 17. Heb. i. 3. 8.'

And in reply to the charge of Socinianism, he says, ‘I have heard of some, beyond the sea, that went under that name, Socinians, who were accused with denying the divinity of Christ; but I know of none here that either deny the divinity of Christ, or him to be of one substance with the Father; if our opposers do know of any such, they may tell them of it, and not accuse the innocent with the guilty, as they have done to us.—We had not our principles either from Arius or Socinus, neither did we ever deny the divinity of Christ (or his being of the same substance with the Father), as Arius, Socinus, and others are accused; so that therein we are very unjustly compared and misrepresented, for which I can say the Lord forgive these our prejudiced opposers. But it is no strange thing for us to be called by nick-names, by these and such false accusers, for one while they were wont to revile us for wanting learning, being illiterate, &c.—another while they accused us falsely with being Free-willers, Arminians, &c. because we plead for the free grace of God to all men: and now we are falsely reckoned Socinians, and most injuriously accused with denying the divinity of Christ the Son of God, which we are ever always clear of, still confessing him according to the Scriptures, both in his sufferings, dominion, and glory, who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.*

Was not Geo. Whitehead, Penn’s associate in the controversy, as likely as Verax to be acquainted with his real opinions, and as well qualified to defend them? how is it that his defence is at complete variance with the Appeal?

William Penn in his ‘Innocency with her open Face,’ describes the occasion of his imprisonment in the Tower as follows: ‘That which I am credibly informed to be the greatest reason of my imprisonment, and that noise of blasphemy which hath pierced so many ears of late, is, my *denying the divinity of Christ, and divesting him of his eternal Godhead*, which most busily has been suggested as well to those in authority, as *maliciously insinuated* amongst the people.’†—The reason Penn here assigns for the outcry against him, corresponds with Whitehead’s; and I cannot suppose that Verax, who must be acquainted with the controversies that have existed for several centuries respecting the divinity and pre-existence of Christ, will hazard an assertion that Penn’s adversaries did not mean the divinity of Christ in the common and usual acceptation of the phrase, when they accused Penn of denying it. And if they are to be understood in that sense, how can we reconcile it with Penn’s veracity that he should reject the accusation as a ma-

* Whitehead’s Divinity of Christ, p. 32, 33, 34. 38, 39.

† Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 267.

licious insinuation, if he really disbelieved the divinity of Christ. But as Verax seems to think Penn's enemies were justified in their accusation against him from the obvious 'Unitarian tendency' of 'the Sandy Foundation Shaken,' let us see whether Penn was of the same sentiment. In his 'Innocency with her open Face,' after saying that he believed 'the Lord Jesus Christ really to be the mighty God,' adds, 'And for a more ample satisfaction, let my reply to J. Clapham be perused, in which Christ's divinity and eternity is very fully asserted. Judge then, impartial reader, (to whom I appeal in this concern) whether my Christian reputation hath not been unworthily traduced; and that those several persons who have been posting out their books against me, have not been beating the air and fighting with their own shadows, in supposing what I never thought, much less writ of, to be the intention of my book.*

Thus he was so far from acknowledging to, or being sensible of, 'the obvious Unitarian tendency of the whole of his work,' that he rejects having so much as thought of divesting Christ of his eternal Godhead in that book; consequently he was not obliged to deny the eternal Deity of Christ, afterwards, to support his consistency, and to keep clear 'from the charge of temporizing.'

Penn having referred to 'The Guide Mistaken,' in reply to J. Clapham, for a more ample satisfaction of his belief in Christ's eternity, I shall present the reader with the passage he probably adverts to, viz. 'Thou must not, reader, from my querying thus, conclude, we do deny (as he has falsely charged us) those glorious Three, which bear record in heaven—the Father, Word, and Spirit; neither the infinity, eternity, and divinity of Jesus Christ; for that we know he is the mighty God; nor what the Father sent his Son to do on the behalf of lost man; declaring to the whole world we know no other name by which atonement, salvation, and plenteous redemption comes; but by his name are, according to our measures, made sensible of its mighty power.†

Verax has before seen this passage; it is quoted at length in the very pamphlet to which his is professedly a reply, namely in 'The Examination,' &c. by Vindex, but instead of noticing its genuine complexion, he passes it over slightly, saying, in answer to Vindex, that 'Penn himself calls it not an *apology* but a "*caution*," and 'that he expressly gives it for the better explanation of those very Unitarian passages, for which Vindex would represent it as an apology.‡ In this I agree with him, but must

* Penn's Works, Vol. I. p. 268. † Ibid. Vol. II. p. 14.

‡ Vindication, p. 4.

also add, that this 'better explanation' entirely militates against his suggestion of Penn's intending those passages to have an Unitarian tendency.

Verax has entered into a criticism upon Penn's rejection of the phrase co-eternal (in the preceding page of this work), as applied to Christ in distinction from his Father, at the same time that he says he is as far from questioning Christ's eternity, as ready to scruple that phrase; Verax asks, How one part of this sentence is to be reconciled with the other? the first question rather is, whether co-eternal and eternal have exactly the same meaning—whether the former phrase does not imply two distinct and separate beings, consequently two eternals: for though the Friends believe the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost to be eternal, 'yet they are not three eternals, 'but one eternal: '* Penn consequently might reject the phrase co-eternal for the same reason as he rejects the phrase, distinct and separate persons; 'therefore the inference Verax draws from it, viz. that Penn, by rejecting the phrase co-eternal, must have used eternal in a limited sense, is not deducible from this passage.

To Clapham's reflection on the Quakers that they openly deny the doctrine of the Trinity—after observing that Trinity is not a scripture phrase, Penn proceeds, 'Yet, if by Trinity he 'understands those three witnesses in heaven, Father, Word, 'and Spirit, he should have better acquainted himself with what 'we do disown, than ignorantly thus to blaze abroad our open 'denial of what we most absolutely credit and believe.†

In Penn's Key, written so late as 1692, from which I have already given an extract in the preceding letter to John Evans, page 5, he says, 'Let the poor Quakers, and their abused principles, 'have better entertainment with thee, reader; and do not 'conclude,—because they assert Christ to be the word of God, 'and that he is revealed in the heart, according to the scripture, 'and that the Scripture, in that excellent sense, is not so; that 'therefore they deny the divine authority of the Scriptures, and 'that the mind and truth thereof, as declared by them, is not in 'any sense the word of the Lord to men: or because they do 'not receive the schoolmen's Trinity, that therefore they deny 'the Scripture Trinity of Father, Word, and Spirit: or that 'they deny the divinity of Christ the word.' And a little further on in the same work, 'Reader, thou plainly seest, that 'they believe the light to be divine, and the Scriptures to be of 'divine authority; that they own the Scripture Trinity or holy 'Three of Father, Word, and Spirit, to be truly and properly

* The creed of Athanasius—It afterwards adopts the phrase co-eternal, but this does not appear quite consistent with the above.

† Penn's Works, Vol. II. p. 18.

‘one; that Christ is God, and that Christ is man; that he came in the flesh, died, rose again, ascended, and sits on God’s right hand, the only sacrifice and mediator for man’s happiness.’*

It is likewise in this work that, in reply to the charge that ‘the Quakers deny Christ to be God,’ Penn says, ‘A most untrue and uncharitable censure; for their great and characteristic principle being this, that Christ, as the Divine Word, lighteth the souls of all men that come into the world, with a spiritual and saving light, according to John i. 9. viii. 12. (which nothing but the Creator of souls can do), it does sufficiently shew they believe him to be God, for they truly and expressly own him to be so, according to the Scripture, viz. In him was life, and that life was the light of men; and he is God over all blessed for ever;’ and to the objection that ‘the Quakers deny the human nature of Christ,’ he answers, ‘We never taught, said, or held so gross a thing.—For as we believe him to be God over all blessed for ever, so we do as truly believe him to be of the seed of Abraham and David after the flesh, and therefore truly and properly man, like us in all things, sin only excepted.’†

Thus W. Penn three times in the course of one Treatise (and that written so late as the year 1692), endeavours to impress the reader with the Friends’ belief in the Scripture Trinity of Father, Word, and Holy Spirit, and that when, as Verax observes, he was probably acquainted with the doubtful authenticity of 1 John v. 7. consequently he could not be supposed to have considered the doctrine of the Trinity, to be dependent upon the ‘particular adoption of the above text, as though it were original, apostolical and divine.’‡ This supposition is justified by R. Claridge, who after having stated, at considerable length, the various explanations given to the school terms, adopted in explaining the Trinity, proceeds to give his own sentiments, ‘Is it not better and safer to speak of the mysterious Trinity in the language of the Holy Ghost, than in their invented terms and phrases:—therefore in this and all other articles of faith and doctrines of religion in common to be believed, in order to eternal salvation, let not the opinions, explications or conceptions of men, which are often dubious, various, or erroneous, be esteemed as a rule or standard; but let every one rely upon the divine testimony of the holy Scriptures, which declare that God is one, and there is none other besides him, and that the one God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, or as it is expressed, 1 John v. 7. The Father, the

* Penn’s Works, Vol. II. p. 789, 790. † Ibid. Vol. II. p. 783.

‡ Vindication, p. 16.

‘ Word, and the Holy Ghost : though that text is suspected by many learned men, it being not met with, as Pool informs us, in Nazeanzen, Athanasius, Didymus, Chrysostom, Cyril,’ &c. nor urged in the Nicene council against Arius; for though it quote v. 6. yet it omits v. 7. either because they found it not in the original, or doubted its authority. Neither is it found in many Greek and Latin copies, nor in the Syriac, Arabic, or Ethiopic versions;’ and after producing some more authorities to the same effect, he concludes, ‘ But whether that verse be dubious or authentic is not much material, because in other places of Scripture the substance of it is recorded.’*

I have been induced to give this passage more at length, because only partially noticed by Verax, notwithstanding it was as necessary for his reader’s information as any of the preceding extracts, he has produced with so much apparent candour, though they really affect not the point at issue, but simply relate to the different and confused explications of the school terms *homousios*, *Ousia*, *Hypostasis*, *Prosopeon* & *Persona*, and the consequent inefficiency of these phrases to explain the Scripture Trinity. Verax has also omitted the following extract, though he quotes what immediately succeeds it. ‘ Calvin calls the terms “ Trinity of persons invented names,” ‘ and wisheth “ they had been buried, provided this faith were universally agreed upon, that the Father, Son, and Spirit are one God.”† I do not suppose even Verax will think of ranking Calvin among the Socinians, or as an unbeliever in the divinity of Christ; yet our first Friends have no more denied either the Trinity, or divinity of Christ than he has here done. Indeed by rejecting the phrase *Trinity of persons*,’ they have, according to Calvin, only rejected *invented names*,’ and not the doctrine itself.

Verax says, ‘ Perfect consistency, as relating to the precision of Penn’s language on this subject, I have not claimed, but consistency of intention, and sincerity of mind, I must still contend for on his behalf, &c.’‡ He will not have to contend with me for Penn’s consistency of intention, or sincerity of mind. With regard to the want of precision in Penn’s language, so as to occasion an apparent inconsistency, I believe this will only apply to two of his early tracts, viz. ‘ The Sandy Foundation Shaken,’ and ‘ The Guide Mistaken,’ and each of these contain their own correctives, which fully evince the author’s care and desire to prevent misconstruction. Verax, by insinuating that Vindex considered these passages as ‘ very nearly allied to recantations’ of the tracts of which they form a part, endeavours to make Vindex appear to be as partial to in-

* Claridge’s Life and Posthumous Works, p. 413, 414, 415.

† Claridge’s Works, p. 393. ‡ Vindication, p. 13.

congruities and paradoxes, as he has shown himself to be. Why did Verax suppress those words ‘Mistake me not, &c.’ in the *Appeal*, as he cannot deny them to have been intended by the author as a ‘better explanation of those very Unitarian passages,’ (as he calls them) with which he has favoured his readers; and when he at last quotes them in his reply to Vindex, why not inform us how we are to reconcile them with his Unitarian construction of other passages in the same treatise? If he return the question, by asking how these passages can admit of a Trinitarian construction, my extracts from the *Sandy Foundation Shaken*, and *Whitehead’s Divinity of Christ* are an answer to him: from them it appears, that by ‘their Trinity,’ which Penn says ‘has not so much as a foundation in Scripture,’ he means a ‘Trinity of distinct and separate persons,’ or ‘three distinct and separate holy ones,’ which he rejects as contrary to the scriptural doctrine of the unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit: upon no other ground can we support his ‘consistency of intention, and sincerity of mind.’ Verax’s hypothesis reduces us to the alternative, that Penn must either have written nonsense, or flagrantly contradicted himself.

Of the caution or apology, for it is indifferent which we term it, in ‘*The Guide mistaken*,’ Verax says, that Penn ‘expressly gives it for the better explanation of those very Unitarian passages, for which Vindex represents it as an apology.’ ‘Whether this explanation,’ continues Verax, ‘be well calculated to elucidate the preceding passages, or is, strictly speaking, perfectly consistent therewith, I have not ventured to affirm.’* Is here not some mistake? did Verax really intend to intimate that this caution, expressly given by Penn for a better explanation of the preceding passages, is not well calculated to elucidate them? could he for a moment think that the reader would hesitate whom to choose as the best expositor of these controverted passages, Penn or Verax? after this we need not enquire, why the reader is not trusted with Penn’s exposition. ‘*The Monthly Reviewers’ Critique* on a similar passage from ‘*Innocency with her open Face*’ was, probably, not forgotten.

In the *Appeal* there are some citations from Penn’s *Christian Quaker*, who, in this work, makes a distinction between the Godhead and manhood of Christ, and very justly remarks that to the divinity that dwelt in the body, must be principally ascribed the virtue and efficacy of whatever it did in and through the body; the same as if we were to say, that any virtue a man practises, is to be ascribed to his soul principally, and to his body only secondarily and instrumentally, as being only the in-

strument of that immortal spark of life which dwells in it. The following paragraph is not inserted by the author of the Appeal, although close upon an extract he has given, and immediately connected with his subject.

‘ I further confess, that his righteous life with respect to its appearance in that holy body, was grieved by sin, and that the weight of the iniquity of the whole world, with the concernment of its eternal well-being, lay hard upon him; nor was his manhood insensible of it, under the load of this did he travail, he alone trod the wine press, that is, all others were then insensible of that eternal wrath, which would be the portion of impenitent persons, as well as that it was his great care and deep travail, that the holy, yet oppressed seed might arise over the pressures of iniquity in the hearts of men, to bruise the serpent’s head in all; and as outwardly he gave his outward life for the world, so he might inwardly shed abroad in their souls the blood of God, that is, the holy purifying life and virtue which is in him as the Word—God, and as which he is the light and life of the world.’*

The following is from the 16th chapter; ‘ Before I conclude, take this notable saying of Christ to the Jews, and what may be collected from it to our purpose: Before Abraham was I am, Abraham saw my day and rejoiced. Which affords us briefly thus much; that though he was not so visibly come, yet it was the same He that came above one thousand six hundred years ago, who was with the Fathers of old, and that Abraham, who lived one thousand nine hundred years before that outward appearance, saw him and his day. If this be not the import of the place I know none; for the Jews not believing him to be the Messiah, thought it high presumption for him to compare with Abraham. “ Art thou greater than our father Abraham, who is dead, and the prophets are dead? whom makest thou thyself?” said that unbelieving people: unto which he answered (that he might prove himself to be the true Messiah, the Christ of God), “ Abraham saw my day and rejoiced:” they still harping upon that visible body, or outward man, not thirty-three years old, replied, “ Thou art not yet fifty, and hast thou seen Abraham?” taking that to be the Messiah, the Christ of God, and Saviour of the world he meant, which they saw with their carnal eyes: to which he rejoined with a “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was I am,” &c. By all which it is most clear,—Christ that then spoke must needs have been long before Abraham’s time, and that such holy ancients were not without a sight and prospect of him, and the day of his glorious appearance, or that most signal mani-

• festation of himself in the body prepared for that great and
 • holy purpose.— And this is unquestionably confirmed unto us,
 • by that known and weighty expression of the apostle Paul to
 • the Romans : “ Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as con-
 • cerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed
 • for ever, Amen.” Since here both Christ is distinguished from
 • the body he took, and also made one with God, who is over
 • all, blessed for ever, Amen; as much as to say, Of whose flesh
 • Christ took, therefore Christ was before he took it; or his
 • taking it did not only constitute him Christ, which Christ is
 • God : and if God (which cannot be said of mere flesh, or any
 • corporeal lineage), then must he have been from all everlasting.*
 Again in chapter 18, ‘ That body was the divine life’s, “ a body
 “ hast thou prepared me,” therefore all that was done by that
 • body towards the redemption of mankind was evidently the
 • divine life’s.—Consider what I say, with this qualification, that
 • ultimately and chiefly, not wholly and exclusively, the divine
 • life in that body was the Redeemer, for the sufferings of that
 • holy body of Jesus had an engaging and procuring virtue in
 • them, though the divine life was that fountain from whence
 • originally it came, and as the life declared and preached forth
 • itself, through that holy body, so who did then come to the
 • benefit procured by the divine life, could only do it, through
 • an hearty confession of it as appearing in that body.—This is
 • the main import of those places; “ whom God hath set forth to
 “ be a propitiation,” and “ in whom we have redemption through
 “ faith in his blood :” for who is this he, whom God hath sent
 • forth, and in whom is redemption ? certainly the same he that
 • was before Abraham, the rock of the fathers, that cried, “ Lo,
 “ I come to do thy will, O God, a body hast thou prepared me ;”
 • which was long before the body was conceived and born. But
 • some may say, how is it then his blood ? why, just as his body is
 • his body. Those who had faith in that blood, believed his visible
 • appearance, inasmuch as they acknowledged that great seal
 • and ratification of it, to wit, the shedding the blood of his
 • body, who came to save the world, and who alone is the pro-
 • pitiation, redemption, and salvation, of all who had, and have
 • right faith in that appearance.—Faith in his blood was requi-
 • site, that they might confess him, whose body and blood it was,
 • to be the Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever.—So
 • that the stress lies in confessing to the divinity come in the
 • flesh, otherwise they would have rejected not only the most
 • signal suffering of the whole manifestation, but consequently
 • that itself.† The following extracts from the 19th chapter
 will elucidate the drift of Penn’s reasoning in his Christian

Quaker—‘ That which remains to complete our scriptural discourse of the divine light, is to pronounce it that which our enemies despise to call it, and do not a little undervalue both us and it, because we do—I mean, Christ. Not that the manifestation of light in every conscience is the entire Christ; but that Christ, the Word-God, is that light of righteousness which lighteth all men; for which the Scripture is most express in that so well known (but little believed) passage, delivered to us by the beloved disciple, who best knew what his Lord was, and stood in no need of their information how to denominate, or rightly characterize him; although they and others implicitly accuse him of weakness, obscurity, nay of error, if not blasphemy too; who make it all this in a poor Quaker, for only believing on pure conviction this one weighty passage, “ That was the true light which enlightens all mankind coming into the world.” I have so thoroughly handled this matter in a late book, entitled, *The Spirit of Truth vindicated*, that I need the less enlarge at this time; to which I refer the reader for satisfaction, concerning some objections raised against the place. However I will briefly consider it here, and—observe that two things are commonly urged against our understanding of the first nine verses of John, as they respect the light.’

1. ‘ Some say that the light here spoken of is not a supernatural, and consequently no saving light, but the light of common reason: others call it, of nature decayed by the fall; and what conviction ariseth thence is only the imperfect remains of that natural light, which these men—grant all have, as well before as after Christ’s coming in the flesh.’

2. ‘ Others say, that this is indeed an universal and saving light, but they restrain it to Christ’s visible appearance, and make the *all* to be all those only that shall believe; and the world to be the new spiritual world Christ came to create, by saving knowledge, which believers came into.’

‘ I shall briefly answer both:—It is agreed by the first sort, that in the beginning of this chapter, Christ’s eternal Divinity is declared by the evangelist, since some of them tell us out of Eusebius, that it was written on that very occasion; one Cerinthus then denying any such thing. The Word which was with God, and was and is God; this God, the same person tells us, in his first epistle, is light; that by him all things are made; among the rest, mankind: he then tells us that this Word had life, and from thence descends to inform us, what the Word was with respect to man: in him, the word was life, and the life the light of men; and that as such, he was that true light which lighteth all mankind coming into the world.’ After proving the light to be divine, and thereby removing the

first objection, Penn proceeds to answer the second, saying, ' That it is not only a most false, but injurious notion, to assert the commencement—or being of that light to men, only to be from the coming of Christ in the flesh. Besides—I cannot conceive how that exposition can be valid : for then John would have been before Christ, instead of Christ's being before Abraham.—And to say nothing at this time of the miserable estate those of mankind must labour under, antecedently to Christ's coming in the flesh, let it be considered, that these nine verses in John relate not in the least to his fleshly appearance, from whence those men would date both his original, and man's illumination, but are a continued series of the highest proofs of his Divinity, that we might as well know what he was before he came, as when he did come : and the one was an introduction to the other. Neither is it fair for these men to allegorize Christ out of his Divinity, and yet deny us an allegory to prove it.—Further let me add, that he who then came into the world, was the same that *created* that world into which he came, and therefore previous, or before such coming, so neither can it hold that the world into which man comes, is the new creation, &c.*'

If W. Penn is to be considered as disbelieving the Divinity of Christ, merely because he makes a distinction between the Godhead and manhood of Christ : I believe it will be difficult, if not impossible, to find a single person who can be said to believe Christ to be God. But what can be more captious, or be a greater proof of a mind warped by prejudice, than to deny a person to be a believer in the eternal Divinity of Christ, unless he also believes the body which Christ took of the Virgin Mary to be co-eternal with Christ himself ?

W. Penn having in his Christian Quaker referred us to his book entitled, ' The Spirit of Truth vindicated,' and as Verax in his Vindication undertakes to explain the tenor of that work, it is necessary to advert to it, before we leave Penn.

The first paragraph of this work is as follows : ' *I cannot but esteem it a peculiar providence of mercy from the most high God to us his most despised people ;—that after our several years pressure under the heavy calumnies of being involved with a Socinian confederacy, he should so suffer it to come to pass, that without the least provocation given on our parts, one of that sort of men should become our compurgator, indeed our best advocate in pleading against us, for whilst he goes about to detect the Quakers of an erroneous spirit, it is to be supposed that he denies them any share in his, and therefore no Socinians. I hope whatever comes of this debate, we shall no longer suffer for being what we are not ; it*

' would be hard that we should be condemned for Socinians, and then abused for refusing to be so: let them not be offended with me if I use the word, it is not from any undervalue of the man they take it from, nor out of any reproach to them, but only as a word of difference to distinguish persons or persuasions by.*

In the foregoing paragraph the italics distinguish what is omitted by Verax. Without enquiring into his motives, for not citing the whole, it clearly appears from it, that Penn rejects the charge of Socinianism against the Quakers, as false, using the word as distinguishing persons or persuasions. The following extracts from this work of Penn's will assist to elucidate the sentiments of the Socinians of his time, also his opinion respecting them.

' We reverently confess to Christ's appearance, both in flesh and spirit; and when called to it, shall be as ready, hearty, and Christian (God assisting), in our confession of the same, as to the beginning, progress, and end of that blessed manifestation, as the person who accuses us. But we dare not say, that the entire Christ was that visible body that was crucified, as believing (with the Scripture) most sincerely, that he that took upon him the seed of Abraham, according to the flesh, was, and is, and is to come, God over all, blessed for ever: which persuasion, I know to be most heretical in this adversary's apprehension, and no part of his †Biddlean creed.‡

Penn afterwards divides his adversary's objections to Geo. Fox's quotations of Scriptures into three sorts, viz.—1st. Such as may refer to doctrinal difference, I mean ' wherein he opposeth us.'—2d. ' Such as refer to his Socinian interpretation of the Scriptures, wherein Christ's divinity is asserted, where we oppose him.'—3d. ' Such as are merely trivial, &c. &c.' § Under the first head upon his opponent's interpretation of the following text of John, ' That was the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world,' who says that in the Greek it is ' coming' and not ' that cometh,' so that it may refer to the light, and not to man, Penn says, ' As to the drift of our adversary in his transposition of the participle, viz. The divesting Christ of all right to eternal divinity (which is the snake in the grass), I shall anon sufficiently, I hope, vindicate that great truth.||

And after charging his adversary with an intention ' to de-throne Christ from the seat of his eternal majesty,' he pro-

* Vol. II. p. 93.

† From John Biddle, who was the Founder of the only Socinian society then established in England.

‡ Vol. II. p. 96.

§ Ibid. p. 112.

|| Ibid. p. 116.

ceeds to prove the Messiah that then came into the world to be ' God, both by pre-existence and omnipotency.*' which passing over for the sake of brevity, I shall proceed to the section entitled, ' Scriptures Socinianized,' in which Penn says,

' His (the Socinian's) next perversion of Scripture is that in John, which he saith G. F. often useth, and always abuseth as he remembers : I doubt his memory much, but let us hear it; And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory I had with thee before the world was : thus the Scripture; but G. F. thus, Christ who was glorified before the world began," on which read his comment, " You will say perhaps, his words and Christ's are the same in sense, but doth God give G. F. his infallible Spirit to correct his Son Christ's words." ' He proceeds, " Nay doth not G. F. take his phrase in a diverse sense from what Christ intended by his; for (says he), it is manifest that Jesus prayed now to be glorified with the glory, wherewith he was not now glorified, but God was glorious before the world was, therefore Jesus intended by the glory he had with the Father before the world was, the glory he had given him in decree before the world was."

' The clinch is foolish, and his consequence false and pernicious : for what if Christ was not then glorified, must it therefore follow, that he was not in being, much less glorified before the world was? Can he be so great a stranger to the apostle's doctrine delivered in his epistle to the Philippians, where we find him first equal with God, as being in his very form or essence ; next making himself of no reputation, then appearing in the fashion or likeness of men, and lastly, that he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross, which shows that he was in an exalted and glorified estate before he humbled himself, else how was he humbled? and it is a piece of sacrilege, and ingratitude ' I almost tremble to think on,' &c. as I have already quoted in my letter to J. Evans, see page 9. and then he proceeds, ' Nor does this Scripture at all make for his opinion; " for Jesus was not yet glorified;" since it might as well have been said, he has not yet died the death of the cross, neither is risen and ascended, which was the period of that state, unto which he has from the form of God humbled himself, even to the being of no reputation, which he thus expresseth himself; " I have glorified thee on earth, I have finished the work thou gavest me to do:" ' And in another place thus, " I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world." Again, " I leave the world, and go to the Father;" ' where is the

'same reason that we should believe he was with the Father before he came into the world, as that he did come into the world, and afterwards go to the Father again; else why is it again going to the Father? But now let me ask him, if he can be so brazened as to think, that God allows him, not only "to correct his Son Christ's words," but the very substance of his prayer?—That ever any man should undertake to correct others in that, which doth not deserve it, whilst the beam is in his own eye, and he is himself most guilty! My soul blesteth God, that our religion is above these slight shifts. I would tell the man in his own words of us, though more seriously, that he, whom G. F. and all of us call Christ, by way of excellency, was, in the sense aforementioned glorified before the world began: and if what he calls Christ was not, it is to us a proof, that he was not that true Christ, which both appeared to the fathers of old (for the rock followed them, and that rock was Christ), and in the fashion of a man in these latter times, humbling himself to the death of the cross.—He is very angry with G. F. that he makes Christ speak these words by the prophet Amos, "Behold I am pressed under you, as a cart is pressed with sheaves," which, says he, belongs to the Lord or Jehovah. Grant it, does it not therefore belong unto Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever; that said, Before Abraham was I am?"*

Penn next proceeds to vindicate Fox's words, 'The seed is Christ, and Christ is all,' charges the Socinian with denying Christ to be all in all, then brings the apostle's words in Col. iii. 11. 'But Christ is all and in all,' in defence of G. Fox, and makes the following deduction from them; 'And if Christ be all and in all, and he that is all and in all, be the true and living God; then because Christ is all and in all, Christ is the true and living God.'

Next follows that passage, upon which Verax, in his Vindication, has displayed his abilities for verbal criticism in relation to Penn's construction of John i. 1. 4. that it should be read, 'the word took flesh,' rather than that 'the very word became very flesh, I mean visible to carnal eyes.' I most cordially unite with Penn's construction of the passage, but cannot see with Verax, whercin it opposes the doctrine of the incarnation, and therefore we are not to be surprised if Penn and others of our first Friends have expressed their belief in that doctrine.

Were I to transcribe the whole of this section, it would be one continued proof of Penn's unequivocal belief in the Divinity of Christ, I shall therefore hasten to the last Socinian objection to G. Fox's citation of Scripture, which is made to his

calling Christ God (instead of Lord), both of the dead and living; to which Penn answers:—

‘If Christ be God over all, as saith the apostle, then why not God both of the dead and of the living, as well as Lord both of the dead and of the living.—I am well assured that God is called judge of quick and dead, and if so, then because Christ is Lord of quick and dead, Christ the Lord is God of both quick and dead;—in short, Christ is called both God, Lord, and Judge; and since there is but one only true God, Lord, and Judge of right Christians, we therefore believe Christ to be that only true God, Lord, and Judge of both quick and dead. And here let me caution the man of his eager opposition to Christ’s Divinity, since supposing it should not be true, there can be no detraction; and if it should prove true, as he may one day know, he will be guilty of robbing Christ of that, for which he thought it no robbery himself to be equal with God; that is to be the only true God himself.’*

This is the last paragraph in the section entitled, ‘Scriptures Socinianized,’ which, together with those that precede, sufficiently shows that Penn used the word Socinian as appropriate to those who denied the Divinity of Christ.

I shall close my extracts from this author on the present subject with the following passage taken from his postscript to ‘The Spirit of Truth vindicated.’

‘I am to advise the man, if he intends any further controversy with us, that he should not lose his time, nor trouble us in the defence of any common principles, wherein we are judged to err; but if he please to be so open with us, as to come forth in what we have some ground to believe his complexion, that is to say, If he will tell us that Christ is but *purus homo*, purely a man; that the holy Spirit is a creature; that Father, Son, and Spirit are three distinct essences and persons; that the soul is mortal, with some other like articles of his Biddlean creed, then I hope we shall endeavour to maintain the truth as it is in Jesus, and to give a sufficient reason of the hope that is in us.’†

Among the erroneous sentiments with which Wm. Penn charges his opponent, those of believing Christ to be purely a man, and the soul to be mortal, are what distinguish some of the modern Socinians. Joseph Priestley has written a treatise to prove the soul material, and as mortal as the body, which has been answered by John Whitehead. And in a small pamphlet, entitled, ‘A familiar Illustration of certain passages of Scripture,’ Priestley explains Christ’s prayer, John xvii. 5. ‘of the glory which was intended for him in the councils of God

'before all time,' which explication is exactly similar to that repelled by Penn, as a perversion of the text. I mention this to shew that the arguments for and against the Divinity of Christ, have not undergone such a revolution, since the days of Penn, as to involve the language of his time in the obscurity insinuated by Verax, to support a position which must inevitably fall to the ground if our first Friends are admitted to speak for themselves, and their words taken in their present proper acceptation. Hence his demand for a 'liberal allowance for the peculiar complexion of the times in appreciating the real meaning of our early writers;' hence his complaint of 'the difficulty of gathering the true import of many passages which may not have been thought obscure, or ambiguous by the writer himself, or his contemporaries;' of 'doubtful or contradictory expressions' of Penn's writings being 'deeply tinged with the sort of language which was then current in theology;' hence he discovers our early friends had 'some failings peculiar to the genius of the age and country in which they lived,' and that from 'mistaken motives they discovered a great, if not too great an anxiety, to reconcile their own impressions of religious truth, with the current orthodoxy of the day, which has occasioned a correspondent degree of obscurity in their writings.'*

Is this accusation against our first Friends consistent with their well known integrity and unshaken zeal for whatsoever they apprehended to be truth? to what motive can we attribute Verax's insinuation that they did not truly and unequivocally believe in those doctrines they published to the world as their faith, except to a desire to throw a veil over their real sentiments, in order to mislead his reader?

He has endeavoured to sanction his charge of ambiguity against Penn by the authority of Joseph Gurney Bevan, but before we concede to his claim upon this writer, he must first prove Penn, Barclay, and Penington to have been illiterate characters, not understanding the rules of grammar, and that they 'had never conversed much with the learned world; and their style was consequently unformed.'† J. G. Bevan's observations principally referred to George Fox, who, it is well known, was far from being a literary character; and the instances he produces in support of his observations, relate rather to grammatical inaccuracies, than to variations in the import of the words used by G. Fox.

Verax, by a partial quotation from J. G. B.'s Refutation, endeavours to extend the charge of ambiguity to R. Barclay.

* Vindication, p. 19, 20.

† 'A Refutation of the more modern misrepresentations of the Society of Friends, &c.' by Joseph Gurney Bevan. p. 53. 54.

That the reader may judge of Verax's candour in this one instance (for I do not intend following him through all his mutilated quotations), I shall give the passage with its context. To Mosheim's charge that Barclay expressed the Quakers' tenets 'in terms of a vague and indefinite nature,' &c. J. G. B. replies,

*'This is indeed a singular charge; yet some of its extraordinary inconsistency might indeed disappear, could it be proved that the terms of Barclay were vague and indefinite. On the contrary, his terms, by which I suppose it to be understood the words which he uses, are, I think it will be allowed, as simple, clear, and definite, as those of any author: and he has this advantage above others, that as he wrote his Apology in Latin and English, each text is to be considered as an original; and each is an undeniable comment on the other; and may serve for the clearing up of any ambiguity that may unintentionally be in the work. A few unusual words occur, which I have apprehended to be either Scotticisms, terms current in theology in the last century, or terms framed by the author to suit his own purpose; but these are generally of obvious meaning. The terms of Barclay being, then, cleared from the imputation of ambiguity, it seems strange to say, that, because he wrote in ordinary language, his method is insidious,' &c.**

The words in italics are suppressed by Verax; it would doubtless have been more favourable to his present purpose for Mosheim's charge of ambiguity against Barclay to have remained in its full force; this is evident from the whole tenor of his reasoning respecting his style, and that of his coadjutors. When we reflect that he has brought the same accusations against our first Friends as their adversaries did formerly, can we admire that he charges their writings with ambiguity, whereby he may claim a licence to put that construction on their words which best suits his own purpose, however repugnant to their real import? I ask for no forced construction on the extracts I have adduced, or may adduce, from the writings of our early Friends, for 'no liberal allowance for the peculiar complexion of the 'times' in which they were written; my only request is, that their own works may speak for them, cleared from that obscurity in which Verax endeavours to involve them.

The fall of man through Adam, and his redemption from it by Christ, is thus expressed by William Penn.

'Man—being tempted to aspire above his place, unhappily yielded against command and duty,—and so fell below it, lost the divine image, the wisdom, power, and purity he was made in; by which, being no longer fit for paradise, he was expelled that garden of God, his proper dwelling and residence, and

‘ was driven out as a poor vagabond, from the presence of the
 ‘ Lord, to wander in the earth, the habitation of beasts. Yet
 ‘ God that made him, had pity on him, for he, seeing man was
 ‘ deceived, and that it was not of malice, or an original pre-
 ‘ sumption in him, but through the subtilty of the serpent (who
 ‘ had first fallen from his own state—), in his infinite goodness
 ‘ and wisdom, found out a way to repair the breach, recover the
 ‘ loss, and restore fallen man again, by a nobler and more excel-
 ‘ lent Adam, promised to be born of a woman, that, as by
 ‘ means of a woman the evil one had prevailed upon man, by
 ‘ a woman also *he* should come into the world, who would pre-
 ‘ vail against him, and bruise his head, and deliver man from
 ‘ his power: and which, in a signal manner, by the dispen-
 ‘ sation of the Son of God in the flesh, in the fulness of time,
 ‘ was personally and fully accomplished by him, and in him, as
 ‘ man’s Saviour and Redeemer.’*

Is this the language of a Socinian? May we not retort upon Verax, by reminding him of his excellent maxim, only reversing his conclusion? ‘ Candour, nay, even common justice, requires
 ‘ us to put such a construction on particular passages of any
 ‘ ancient or modern author, as will make them, if possible, con-
 ‘ sistent with the general tenor of his writings; which it is, in
 ‘ this instance, absolutely impracticable to do,’ if we *are* to con-
 ‘ sider William Penn, ‘ in the proper sense of the word as it
 is now understood, a strict Unitarian.’†

* Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 359, 360.

† Appeal, p. 7.

CHAP. III.

Of ROBERT BARCLAY'S sentiments respecting the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and the state of man in the fall—Of GEORGE FOX'S sentiments on the same subjects.

THE reason assigned in the Appeal for Robert Barclay's inattention to the important point of vindicating the unity of God, which Verax says 'our first Friends had the manly boldness 'openly to avow amidst the general deviation of the great body 'of professing Christians,'* is rather singular, after such a declaration; namely, because R. B. 'considered the doctrine of the 'proper unity of God, so clear in itself to every man's reason 'and conscience, that it needed but little to be said by him in 'support of it, as he seems from the whole tenor of his first 'proposition, to consider it as a doctrine already generally 'acknowledged.† Must not the writer of this paragraph have quite mistaken the tenor of Barclay's first Proposition, which is entirely silent respecting the unity or divisibility of God, the subject of it being simply the necessity of a true knowledge of God, in order to attain to true happiness; it is as follows, 'Seeing the height of all happiness is placed in the true knowledge of God, This is life eternal to know thee, the only true 'God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent, (John xvii. 3.) 'the true and right knowledge of this foundation and ground 'of knowledge, is that which is most necessary to be known and 'believed in the first place.' Barclay then proceeds to show that it hath not 'been less the device of the devil to persuade men into 'wrong notions of God, than to keep them altogether from 'acknowledging him,' and remarks, 'How needful and desirable that knowledge is, which brings life eternal, Epictetus

* Appeal, p. 3.

† Ibid. p. 9.

‘ sheweth, saying, excellently well, cap. 38, Know, that the
 ‘ main foundation of piety is this, to have right opinions and
 ‘ apprehensions of God. This therefore I judged necessary, as
 ‘ a first principle in the first place to affirm, and I suppose will
 ‘ not need much further explanation, as being generally acknow-
 ‘ ledged by all,’ &c.*

What is this that is generally acknowledged by all as a first principle? certainly, neither the Socinian nor Trinitarian mode of belief in God, respecting which there was then, and still continues to be, such diversity of opinion. It must have been a common principle acknowledged by both these parties, viz. ‘ That the main foundation of piety is this, to have right ‘ opinions and apprehensions of God.’ What this true knowledge and right apprehension of God is, and how it is to be attained to, is the subject of the second Proposition, which begins as follows: ‘ Seeing no man knoweth the *Father* but the ‘ *Son*, and he to whom the *Son* revealeth him, and seeing the ‘ revelation of the *Son* is in and by the *Spirit*; therefore the ‘ testimony of the *Spirit* is that alone by which the true know- ‘ ledge of God hath been, is, and can be only revealed.’† Is not the doctrine of the Trinity acknowledged in this place? If Verax should deny it, because he cannot discover the school-term person; perhaps he may stand corrected by the following extracts from Barclay’s Vindication of his Apology, ‘ It will ‘ not be amiss here to take notice of his [Brown’s] most uncha- ‘ ritable and unchristian insinuations contrary to all Christian ‘ and fair rules of debate, as first, page 24, where he will needs ‘ infer our denying of the Trinity; albeit he cannot deny, but ‘ he finds it owned by me, groundlessly coupling us with the ‘ Socinians, &c.‡ Again, ‘ According to his (Brown’s) custom, ‘ (though I condemn the Socinians), he will be insinuating, ‘ that I agree with them, to whose notions of the *Spirit* albeit I ‘ assent not, yet I desire to know of him, in what scripture he ‘ finds these words, that the *Spirit* is a distinct person of the ‘ Trinity. For I freely acknowledge, according to the Scripture, ‘ that the *Spirit* of God proceedeth from the *Father* and the ‘ *Son*, and is God,’ &c.§ Whether these extracts produce conviction on Verax’s mind or not, their language is sufficiently intelligible to preclude the necessity of any comment.

Verax asks, ‘ In what strict, proper, or consistent sense can ‘ the man who’ rejects the term person, in speaking of the *Son*, ‘ profess to believe the doctrine of the eternal Divinity of ‘ Christ?’|| This may be answered by another question, In

* Barclay’s Apology, 8th Edit. p. 15. 17.

† Ibid. p. 18.

‡ Barclay’s Works, Fol. Edit. p. 739.

§ Ibid. p. 745.

|| Vindication, p. 23.

what strict, proper, or consistent sense can the man who rejects the term person in speaking of the Father, profess to believe in the doctrine of the eternal Divinity of the Father? We reject the term person to distinguish either the Father, Son, or Spirit from each other, consequently if Verax's argument proves any thing, it must be that we cannot believe in the eternal divinity of either Father, Son, or Spirit. In objecting to the phrase 'Trinity of persons,' we no more deny the Divinity of Christ than Calvin has done. See page 45.

The following confession of John Hancock may probably have more weight with Verax than any argument I can produce; it also approaches nearer the truth than any thing he has written on the subject; 'The Quakers refused to adopt the term of Trinity, because the word was not to be found in Scripture, but many of them, although they startled at the use of the word, adopted the idea designed by that word.'

The first part of this observation is not quite correct, for although that term was objected to by some of them for the reason there assigned, Penn, Barclay, and Claridge, have severally adopted it as descriptive of the doctrine believed by them, which the preceding extracts from their writings prove. And if they adopted the idea designed by that word, Verax must certainly be said to be vainly employed in endeavouring to prove them Socinians.

In the Appeal, page 10, an extract is given from Prop. 2d § 5. of Barclay's Apology, which the reader will find, with its context, in the foregoing letter to John Evans, page 4, where I have also adverted to Verax's supposition that Barclay considered the text therein quoted, from Col. i. 16. as referring to the new creation, and not to the creation of the world. To remove every doubt upon this subject, let us hear what the Apologist says in defence of this passage; 'He' (Brown) 'proceedeth also basely to insinuate, that I deny Jesus of Nazareth to be the Son of God; albeit he doth not so much as pretend to any colour for it from my words.—In pursuance of this, in the following page, he insinuates as if I meant not the first, but the second creation, and so joined with Socinus; which is a gross calumny like the former:* that is, Brown's saying that the Quakers denied the Trinity.

This defence of Barclay against Brown affords us another instance of the little variation that has taken place in the disputes between the Socinians and Trinitarians, respecting the Divinity of Christ, since the days of Penn and Barclay; for Priestley in the pamphlet before alluded to, on Col. i. 16. says, 'In this passage we have a view given us of the great dignity

* Barclay's Works, p. 739.

‘ and dominion to which Christ is exalted by his Father, and of the great and happy change that was made in this world by his gospel; for by creation we are to understand the new creation, or renovation, &c.—I would further observe that the things here said to be created by Christ are not material things, as the heaven and the earth, &c.’ Upon Priestley’s and Verax’s construction of the text, I shall just enquire how Christ can be said to have created ‘ all things visible and invisible,’ if he were not the creator of the visible heaven and earth.

We are presented with a mutilated quotation from Prop. 5. and 6. § 13. Verax’s perversion of which is sufficiently proved by Vindex* in his Examination of the first part of the Appeal, but as Verax in his ‘ Vindication’ has returned to the charge, let us refer the decision of this dispute to Barclay himself, who, in answer to Brown’s perversion of this 13th Sect. says, ‘ His next perversion is yet more gross and abusive, page 228, where, from my denying that we equal ourselves to that holy man, the Lord Jesus Christ, &c. in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelt bodily, he concludes, I affirm him to be no more but a holy man, and because I use the words *Plenitudo Divinitatis*, that I deny his Deity, which is an abominable falsehood. I detest that doctrine of the Socinians, and deny there is any ground for their distinction; and when I confess him to be an holy man, I deny him not to be GOD, as this man most injuriously would insinuate; for I confess him to be really true God and true man. And whereas he rails and exclaims here, and in the following page, as if the comparison I bring betwixt every saint and the man Jesus from the sap, its being otherwise in the root and stock of the tree, than in the branches, did further confirm our equalling ourselves to him; he doth but show his folly; since Christ himself useth the same comparison, John xv. 5. “ I am the Vine, ye are the branches;” to which I alluded; and upon this he runneth out in a vehement strain of railing, exclaiming against us, as if we denied the Deity of Christ and his incarnation, which is utterly false.’†

If Barclay were a Socinian, whence is it that he always disavows it; that he says, he detests that doctrine of theirs which denies the Deity of Christ? These extracts from the work entitled ‘ R. B.’s Apology for the true Christian Divinity vindicated from John Brown’s Examination,’ &c. anticipate the observations I might otherwise have made upon Verax’s constructions of those passages in the Apology to which they refer, for though his arguments may be more refined, they turn upon the same point as Brown’s, viz. that Barclay did not believe Christ to be God, because he believed him also to be man; this

* Examination, p. 14.

† Barclay’s Works, p. 794, 795.

is answered in my last citation. It remains for the reader to determine whose explanation of the Apology he will prefer, that of Robert Barclay, or that of Verax.

The remaining extracts in the Appeal from the Apology, are no more to the purpose than those already considered, for with what propriety could it be said of Christ, 'So hath he likewise poured forth into the hearts of all men a measure of that divine light and seed wherewith he is clothed,'* if he were not God? for the Psalmist says, 'O Lord, my God, thou art clothed with honour and majesty, who coverest thyself with light, as with a garment.' &c.†

As nothing exhibits a more prominent feature of a Socinian than his interpretations of those Scriptures which are supposed to assert the Divinity of Christ; so nothing Barclay has written, more decidedly evinces what his sentiments upon that subject are, than his *Catechism*; for an extract from which, see page 2. of this work; wherein he expresses himself in language, that would require a much greater revolution in the import of theological terms, to evade its force, than can be proved to have taken place. No Socinian or Unitarian wrote that *Catechism*.—Verax may controvert this if he can.

That Robert Barclay believed man to be in a degenerate condition, through the fall of Adam, unable by his own natural powers to restore himself from his lost estate, and that this restoration can only be effected through the inward operation of the grace and spirit of Christ as his Redeemer, is evident from the fourth Proposition of the Apology, in which he thus expresses himself:

'Not to dive into the many curious notions which many have concerning the condition of Adam before the fall; all agree in this, that thereby he came to a very great loss, not only in the things which related to the outward man, but in regard of that inward fellowship and communion he had with God. This loss was signified to him in the command, "For in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." Gen. ii. 17. This death could not be an outward death, or the dissolution of the outward man; for as to that he died not yet many hundred years after, so that it must needs respect his spiritual life and communion with God. The consequence of this fall, besides that which relates to the fruits of the earth, is also expressed, Gen. iii. 24. "So he drove out the man, and he placed at the east of the garden of Eden, cherubims, and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." Now whatever literal signification this may have, we may safely ascribe to this paradise a mystical signification, and truly

* Barclay's Apology, p. 450.

† Psal. civ. 1, 2.

‘ account it that spiritual communion and fellowship which the
 ‘ saints obtain with God by Jesus Christ, to whom only these
 ‘ cherubims give way, and unto as many as enter by him, who
 ‘ calls himself the door. So that though we do not ascribe any
 ‘ whit of Adam’s guilt to men, until they make it theirs by the
 ‘ like acts of disobedience, yet we cannot suppose that men who
 ‘ are come of Adam naturally, can have any good thing in their
 ‘ nature as belonging to it, which he, from whom they derive
 ‘ their nature, had not himself to communicate unto them.
 ‘ If then we may affirm, that Adam did not retain in his nature
 ‘ (as belonging to it), any will or light capable to give him
 ‘ knowledge in spiritual things ; then neither can his posterity.
 ‘ For whatsoever real good any man doth, it proceedeth not
 ‘ from his nature as he is man, or the son of Adam, but from
 ‘ the seed of God in him, as a new visitation of life, in order to
 ‘ bring him out of his natural condition ; so that though it be in
 ‘ him, yet it is not of him.’*

The next author Verax selects to prove our early Friends Unitarians, is GEORGE FOX. Had he attached some degree of ambiguity to his style, and claimed some allowance to appreciate the real meaning of his writings, it would have been rather more admissible than with regard to Penn and Barclay, men of literature, and conversant ‘with the learned world.’ G. Fox was no scholar, hence his language is far from being clear of grammatical inaccuracies, it is to these J. G. Bevan’s remarks, in his ‘Refutation of modern Misrepresentations,’ adverted to by Verax, primarily refer. How then are we to account for the following introduction to that author’s extracts from G. Fox, ‘As to the doctrine of the Trinity, there does not appear any the smallest shadow of approach to it in the writings of this distinguished Friend,—making even the same, or even a much less allowance than has been already claimed for Penn and Barclay,—in consideration of the peculiar turn and genius of the age in which they lived.’† Verax adverting to this paragraph, acknowledges, in his ‘Vindication,’ that he has ‘hazarded a pretty strong negative assertion.’ It appeared to me not only a strong negative assertion, but so unwarranted, that I was surprised at his temerity. An explicit, clear, and correct style is not the most favourable for such writers as Verax, who find it most to their advantage to have some plea for making ‘a liberal allowance for the peculiar complexion of the times in appreciating the real meaning of our early writers ;’ hence, we may account for his predilection in favour of Fox’s style.

Without examining whether George Fox was mistaken in his conceptions of genuine scripture doctrine, which Verax has

* Barclay’s Apology, p. 96, 97.

† Appeal, p. 15.

more than once obliquely hinted; we will examine what his conceptions were respecting the Trinity. My first extract will be from an epistle written in 1685, nearly the whole of which is cited by Verax in his Vindication.

‘Live in the love which God hath shed abroad in your hearts through Christ Jesus, in which love nothing is able to separate you from God and Christ,—nor to hinder or break your heavenly fellowship in the light, gospel, and Spirit of Christ, nor your holy communion in the Holy Ghost, that proceeds from the Father and the Son, which leads you into all truth. In this Holy Ghost (in which is your holy communion) that proceeds from the Father and the Son, you have fellowship with the Father and the Son, and one with another.’*

George Fox does not indeed use the term Trinity, but he so obviously *adopts the idea intended by that word*, that Verax must attach to the word Unitarian an idea different from the common one, when he denominates the epistle from which this extract is taken to be of a ‘decidedly Unitarian complexion.’ Is it because in this epistle George Fox speaks of the Deity in the singular number when in other parts of it he says, ‘the Lord God Almighty,’ &c.? If a belief in ‘one living and true God,’ be all he intends by his ‘pure and simple Unitarianism;’ the Trinitarian and Deist have an equal claim with him to it. Verax has a remark similar to the preceding one, on a citation from Fox in Vindex’s Examination of the Appeal, p. 18. I shall not detain the reader to refute this kind of reasoning, and if Verax should imagine that he hereby obtains cause of triumph, his enjoyment of it will not be interrupted by me.

The following extract from George Fox is also given by Vindex: the strictures upon it by Verax induce me to repeat it in this place.

‘And ye professors, who have given new names to the Father, the Word, and Holy Ghost (as Trinity, and three distinct persons), and say the Scripture is your rule for your doctrine, but there is no such rule in the Scripture, to call them by these new names, which the apostle that gave forth the Scripture doth not give them: and because we do not call the Father, and the Word, and Holy Ghost by your new names, therefore do you falsely say, that the Quakers deny Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; which we own in those names and sound words, in which the holy men of God speak them forth by the Holy Ghost; which ye give other new names to, and yet say ye have not the same spirit, which they had that gave forth the Scriptures; so, which is to be followed, judge yourselves. But this is the record that God hath given unto us eternal

“ life, and this life is in his Son.” And we know that the Son
 ‘ of God is come, and hath given us a mind to know him, which
 ‘ is true, and we are in him that is true, mark, that is, in his
 ‘ Son Jesus Christ, this same is very God and eternal life. And
 ‘ this we, the people of God, in scorn called Quakers, do wit-
 ‘ nefs.’*

The first part of this quotation proves G. Fox to have been anxious to repel the charge that the Quakers denied the doctrine of the Trinity, occasioned by their objection to the school terms, Trinity of distinct persons, &c.; and it confirms what I have just advanced of his adopting the idea intended by the term Trinity, notwithstanding his objection to the word itself, because not to be found in the Scriptures. With respect to the latter part of this quotation, Verax says, ‘ that is, I think, rather expressive of religious feelings, than doctrinal.’ This is gliding ‘ pretty smoothly over’ a difficulty. That G. Fox has expressed his feelings is not denied, but that surely cannot operate to weaken the doctrine conveyed, viz. ‘ that Jesus Christ is very ‘ God and eternal Life.’

I shall next call the reader’s attention to a paper of G. Fox’s, addressed to Mahomet, emperor of the Turks, in consequence of a declaration of war made by him against the emperor of Germany, in which the sultan expresses himself in language of defiance against Christ, a specimen of which is given in the following extract from G. Fox.

‘ Sultan Mahomet, emperor of the Turks, thou sayest, thou
 ‘ art commander of the Christians’ crucified God; and sayest,
 ‘ thou wilt pursue their crucified God, whose wrath thou fearest
 ‘ not.—Answer, These high words are not spoken in the fear
 ‘ of God; for if thou knowest God thou wouldst know his
 ‘ Son Jesus Christ, who was made of the seed of Abraham
 ‘ according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God
 ‘ according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from
 ‘ the dead; so that thou hast neither power over his Godhead,
 ‘ nor his flesh.—And Mahomet saith in his Alcoran, page 30,
 ‘ chap. 33. That John did affirm Christ to be the Messiah, and
 ‘ to be the Word of God. Now if the Turks do believe this,
 ‘ which Mahomet saith in his Alcoran, then you must believe
 ‘ what Christ saith of himself,—and what the apostle John saith
 ‘ of him, “ In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was
 “ with God, and God was the Word, and all things were made
 “ by the Word, and without him was not any thing made that
 “ was made; and in the Word was life, and the life was the
 “ light of men, and that was the true light which enlightens
 “ every man that comes into the world.” Now here is the

* Fox’s Doctrinals, p. 446.

‘divine light which is the life in Christ, the Word, by which
 ‘all things were made, which enlightens every man, &c. And
 ‘John saith, This word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and
 ‘his apostles beheld his glory, as the glory of the only-begotten
 ‘of the Father, full of grace and truth,’ &c. After this follows
 the passage quoted by Verax, wherein Fox says, ‘It is blasphemy
 ‘for the Jews, or any, to say, that they did crucify the true
 ‘Christians’ eternal invisible God,’ and afterwards observes,
 ‘But Christ, which was made of the seed of David, according
 ‘to the flesh, who took not upon him the nature of angels, but
 ‘the seed of Abraham, he suffered for us in the flesh;—and
 ‘though Christ was crucified—through the flesh, yet he is alive,
 ‘and liveth by the power of God, 2 Cor. xiii: so it is clear
 ‘that the eternal, and invisible, incomprehensible God, was not,
 ‘nor cannot be crucified; but Christ, the Son of God, suffered
 ‘according to the flesh, not in his Godhead.’*

I have contracted entirely for the sake of brevity, and I believe without any injury to the sense. Geo. Fox, in this place, describes 1st. Christ’s eternal Divinity. 2d. His clothing himself with flesh, or becoming man. 3d. That he did not suffer death as God, that being impossible, but only according to the flesh. What is there in this to justify the assertion that he must contradict himself, if he, ‘in a strict unqualified sense,’ meant that Christ was God? That he, by confessing to the Godhead of Christ, contradicts Verax, is sufficiently evident; who therefore endeavours to explain away the proper meaning of this expression. Whether the context obliges us to have recourse to a meaning contrary to the obvious one, let the reader judge.

Further on, in this same paper of Fox’s, is the part quoted by Vindex, respecting his belief in the Father, Word, and Holy Ghost. being one God; to evade which, Verax calls in metaphor to his aid. In the paragraph immediately preceding this, Fox speaks of Christ Jesus, the Son of God, ‘by whom he
 ‘made the world, the heavens, the earth, and the seas, and all
 ‘things therein.’† I forbear noticing the other extracts by Verax from this epistle to the Turk, they being chiefly couched in Scripture language, the question therefore is, in what sense Fox quoted them? and this can only be known, by examining them with their context, which may be done by turning to the epistle itself in Fox’s Doctrinals, p. 1003.

The first quotation from George Fox, in the Appeal, has the following expressions, ‘The Lord is King over all the earth;
 ‘therefore, all people, praise and glorify your King in true obedience. Mark, and consider in silence, in lowliness of mind,

* Fox’s Doctrinals, p. 1005, 1006. † Ibid. p. 1009.

‘ and thou wilt hear the Lord speak to thee in thy mind. His voice is sweet and pleasant; his sheep hear his voice,—they rejoice, and are obedient, they also sing for joy;—they sing, and praise the eternal God in Zion.’* I agree with Verax, that these ‘ expressions which have naturally flowed from his pen, afford full and satisfactory evidence of what his real sentiments were.’ They contain an exhortation to attend to the voice of the Lord Jesus Christ, who is King over the whole earth, and speaks in the heart, if we will but attend to his secret inspirations, and, as Christ says himself, his ‘ sheep follow him, for they know his voice, and a stranger will they not follow;’ John x. 4, 5. to which Geo. Fox evidently alludes: they may be also considered as ‘ the genuine effusions of a warm heart-felt piety,’ and very pertinent, as expressive of Fox’s belief in the omniscience and omnipresence of Christ, therefore rather unfortunately introduced into the Appeal, to prove the contrary position.

The remaining quotations given from G. Fox having been already noticed, and the insidious mode of citing them ably exposed, by *Vindex*, in his *Examination* of the Appeal, I shall only remark on the extract from the paper presented to the governor of Barbadoes. Verax introduces his vindication of this extract with an attack on the faithfulness of a quotation from the same, by Henry Tuke, in his work entitled, ‘ *The Faith of the People called Quakers, in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, set forth in various Extracts from their Writings,*’ Phillips, London, 1801; because therein he has only commenced his extract with G. Fox’s belief in Christ, as follows, ‘ We do own and believe in Jesus Christ, his [God’s] beloved and only begotten Son, &c.’ without inserting the confession of faith in ‘ God, the creator of all things,’ that immediately precedes it, which was no doubt omitted for brevity, and because it was no part of the subject of his book. Verax’s captious criticism, together with the sarcastic manner in which it is penned, can serve no purpose but to shew the spirit of the writer.

In reply to *Vindex*’s notice of the omission of the words, ‘ and only begotten’ in the extract given in the Appeal, Verax says, ‘ It seems to me sufficient to justify the omission; to say, that the sense of no part that is quoted depends upon, or is varied by the words omitted.’† The question naturally occurs, What could then be his motive for omitting them? he answers, that he apprehends ‘ that phrase has given rise to as gross conceptions as any *Vindex* can show have arisen from what he calls, speaking of the “ Trinitarian controversy,” in

* Fox’s Journal, p. 37.

† Vindication, p. 43.

‘ page 1, “ the gross term of three persons.” Thus although Verax will not allow the omission of the phrase to vary the sense of the part quoted, he nevertheless allows the addition of the phrase as materially to affect it, as the term ‘ three persons’ affects the doctrine of the Trinity, the rejection of which term, he has before, in p. 22, represented as equivalent to a denial of the doctrine itself. If this latter representation be correct, is he justified in suppressing from the writings of Fox, a phrase so pregnant with meaning, when he is professing to give the sentiments of that Friend to the public by faithful extracts from his works?*

Whether the phrase in question be an interpolation, or genuine scripture, the point in discussion is not affected by it; it being neither respecting the authenticity of scripture, nor what we ought to receive as scripture doctrines; but whether what our first Friends believed in as the primitive apostolic faith, from their views of the Scriptures, and the corresponding convictions of their own minds, will not justify the Society’s conduct in silencing Hannah Barnard as a minister. It will be readily granted, that in our private research after truth, ‘ the first of considerations is not who has believed? but what is ‘ the truth.’ My present design, however, does not necessarily embrace this consideration, it being simply to clear the Society of Friends from the false representations of their doctrines, and from the illiberal censures bestowed on their late determined opposition to the introduction of Socinianism among them.

If Verax be convinced by an investigation of the principles of the Friends, that they are inconsistent with the Scriptures, or his own apprehensions of truth, there is no compulsion; he may quietly withdraw from their communion, and unite himself with a Society, whose sentiments are more congenial with his own views of Christianity.

Before we leave G. Fox, let us examine a few passages in his Doctrinals, which will be sufficiently expressive of his sentiments without the assistance of Verax.

‘ — Rom. ix. 5, &c. The apostle speaking of the fathers, “ of whom,” saith he, “ as concerning the flesh Christ came, “ who is God over all, blessed for ever, Amen.” And this was ‘ the apostle’s doctrine to the church then, who saith, “ I say “ the truth in Christ, and lie not, my conscience bearing me

* Neither does there appear any ground for supposing the best Greek copies do not contain the phrase ‘ only begotten.’ Greisbach is generally considered as the standard for various readings; and Newcome, who translated from Greisbach, retains the phrase, and says in his note, ‘ our Lord is thus called six times in the New Testament.’ Note on John i. 14.

“witness in the Holy Ghost.” (Mark) in Christ, and in the ‘Holy Ghost, which should be every true confessor of Christ his testimony, which we do witness, both as to his flesh, and ‘as he was God.’* This passage is referred to by Vindex, p. 22, of his Examination, wherein he observes that G. Fox adopts the text which calls Christ ‘God over all.’ In answer to this, Verax says, that there is much reason to suppose, from its context, that G. Fox did not adopt the construction Vindex puts upon it, that is, that Christ is God over all. The turn G. Fox has given to Rom. ix. 5. shows he did not adopt the Socinian construction of that text, which Priestley and Verax say, should be ‘Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning ‘the flesh Christ came. God, who is over all, be blessed for ever.’ Our version says, ‘of whom as concerning the flesh Christ ‘came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.’ G. Fox was a plain man, and when he quotes scripture, being unacquainted with the original languages, must be considered as understanding them in their obvious sense, as quoted by him. In the present instance he has not given the text as it stands in our translation, but after the words ‘Christ came,’ adds, ‘who is ‘God over all, blessed for ever.’ G. F. certainly did not intend, by this variation, to alter the sense conveyed by our version; but it indisputably proves he was far from adopting the construction put upon it by Priestley and Verax. To illustrate the import of this extract from G. Fox, Verax refers us to the preceding and following paragraphs; the first contains a quotation from Col. i. 12 to 20. and the last from the 21st, 22d, 26th, and 27th verses of the same chapter, neither of which harmonize with Socinianism; consequently not very appropriate to prove Fox a Unitarian.

There are other extracts from G. Fox in Vindex’s Examination which Verax has treated in a similar manner, and which therefore do not require animadversion, for as I have already observed, the accuracy of our English version of the Scriptures is not the point under discussion, but simply what were the opinions of our first Friends, and whether they would justify the recent proceedings of the Society towards H. Barnard.

The title of the Tract from which the last extract is taken, is, ‘A Testimony of what we believe of Christ, before he was ‘manifest in the flesh; and of his birth and preaching, and ‘what he saith he is himself; as also of his sufferings, death, ‘resurrection, and ascension, both as he was GOD, and as he ‘was man.’

In which George Fox also says—‘And Heb. i. 1. “At sundry ‘times, and after divers manners, God spake unto the fathers

* Fox’s Doctrinals, p. 433.

“ by the prophets, but in these last days he hath spoken unto us
 “ by his Son, whom he hath made heir of all things, by whom
 “ also he hath made the worlds.” Mark, the worlds were
 ‘ made by the Son of God, and God was Adam and Eve’s
 ‘ teacher in paradise; and now the same hath spoken unto us
 ‘ by his Son, by whom the worlds were made. So he is the
 ‘ Quakers’ first speaker, and is the last, the Son of God be-
 ‘ ing the brightness of his Father’s glory, and the express
 ‘ image of his substance; “ And upholding all things by his
 ‘ mighty word and power, hath by himself purged our sins,” &c.*

And in another treatise, ‘ Again, as the Jews hated Christ in
 ‘ the flesh, you that profess him in the flesh, hate this divine
 ‘ light, which is the life in him, and cry, Away with this light:—
 ‘ and Christ Jesus is not known as he is God in his Divinity, nor
 ‘ in his flesh, as he was manifest; but by this his divine heaven-
 ‘ ly light, which we own and believe in, as he commands, who
 ‘ are the children of the light:—and, as it is said, “ Young men,
 “ you are strong, you have overcome the wicked one; fathers,
 “ you have known him from the beginning;” that is, you have
 ‘ known him in his Divinity, you have known him in the pro-
 ‘ mise, and in the prophets, you have known him in his birth
 ‘ and conception by the Holy Ghost, ye have known him in
 ‘ his life, preaching, and miracles,’ &c.†

Again, ‘ God said, “ Let us make man in our image, after
 “ our likeness, and let them have dominion, &c.” Gen. i. 26.
 ‘ Now the Lord said, “ Let us,” and were not all things made
 ‘ and created by Jesus Christ, whose name is called the Word
 ‘ of God.’‡

The following extract adverts to the fall of man, as well as
 to the Divinity of Christ.

‘ God was the first speaker to Adam and Eve in paradise;
 ‘ and as long as they kept under his speaking and teaching,
 ‘ they kept the paradise of God, and in that happy and blessed
 ‘ estate, in the image of God, and in his power, dominion, and
 ‘ wisdom, over all things which God had made. But when
 ‘ they forsook God’s teaching, and followed the serpent’s
 ‘ teaching,—they lost, and fell from the truth and image of
 ‘ God, and the power in which they had dominion, and fell
 ‘ from their perfection, and lost their blessed state in the para-
 ‘ dise of God. Nevertheless, the promise to them and mankind
 ‘ then was, “ The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent’s
 “ head:” and all the fathers and the faithful believed in this
 ‘ promise of God, and died in the faith of it. “ And God
 “ spake by the prophets to these fathers at sundry times, and

* Fox’s Doctrinals, p. 436.

† Ibid. p. 507.

‡ Ibid. p. 992.

“after divers manners, in the old covenant.” But the seed ‘being come, which bruise the head of the serpent, that false teacher;—Christ, who is the Saviour, and the life in these last days, of the new covenant of grace, light, and life, God hath spoken unto us, the children of the new covenant, by his Son, the immortal, eternal, and living God of truth:—so the eternal God of truth, who was the first speaker, he is the speaker again unto his people, by his Son now, in these latter days of the new covenant, and so will be to all eternity; who, by his Son, renews his believers again into the image of God, as Adam was in before he fell; and creates them anew in Christ Jesus, unto good works out of the bad works, that they may come to sit down in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus, that never fell, who is the first and last, by whom all things were made and created, who is over all things, in his life, light, truth, and righteousness, and kingdom of glory, Amen.’*

If Verax still persists to aver that the only deductions we can make from the whole of the preceding extracts from George Fox, are that he considered Christ as the creator of all things in the new creation only; and not that by him this outward temporary system was created, and that he did not believe Christ to be ‘the immortal, eternal, and living God of truth,’ who is over all blessed for ever; to attempt to refute him would be to reflect on the good sense of the reader, as though he needed an expositor to elucidate the plainest expressions in his own mother-tongue.

George Fox’s views of the present fallen condition of man through Adam, may be further collected from the following extracts.

‘The Lord God said, “Thou shalt not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil; for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;” but the serpent said, “If ye eat thereof, ye shall not surely die;” and they did eat, and disobeyed the Lord’s voice and command, and did surely die; and so death passed upon all men, and all died in Adam:—seeing all was dead in Adam, and so plunged into death by disobeying the Lord, and hearkening unto the serpent, so all must be baptized with the baptism of Christ,—before they can come into the paradise of God, and have a right to eat of the tree of life.’† ‘Now all being in the fall of Adam, and Adam and his whole house being fallen from the image of God into sin and darkness, Christ, the second Adam, died for them all, and enlightens them all,’ &c.‡

* Fox’s Doctrinals, p. 741.

† Ibid. p. 725.

‡ Ibid. p. 641.

Speaking of Christ, he says, ‘ Who is the life, the truth,—the way to God, the way again to God, the Father of life, where man is driven from and cannot enter again, but by the light, Christ, the second Adam ; so all being in the light, they are in the way, they have found the way Christ Jesus, the chief shepherd, the bishop of the soul, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever ; who was with the Father before the world began, by whom all was created, who is the soul’s bishop, and the author of man’s salvation and redemption,—and is the offering that offered himself for the sins of the whole world.’*

George Fox does not handle his subjects systematically like Barclay, but his sentiments respecting the fall of man, and the nature of his redemption through the incarnation of the eternal Son of the Father, are evidently in unison with those of the latter Author.—Their obvious Unitarian tendency Verax has yet to prove.

* Doctrinals, p. 174, 175

CHAP. IV.

Of ISAAC PENINGTON'S sentiments respecting the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and the state of man in the fall.—RICHARD CLARIDGE'S Essay on the Doctrine of the Trinity—His Essay on the Doctrine of Christ's Satisfaction cleared from the misconstructions of VERAX.

ISAAC PENINGTON is chosen by Verax to bring up the rear of his evidence in support of Unitarianism; with whom he has also introduced Richard Claridge. His first extract from Isaac Penington is from a tract vindicating the Friends' principles against the objections of their persecutors in New-England. Amongst other objections was this, that the Quakers denied 'the sacred Trinity;' to which our truly valuable elder replies:

'Concerning the sacred Trinity. They generally both in their speakings and in their writings set their seal to the truth of that Scripture, 1 John v. 7. That "there are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit." That these three are distinct, as three several beings or persons: this they read not; but in the same place they read, that they are One: and thus they believe their being to be one, their life one, their light one, their wisdom one, their power one: and he that knoweth and seeth any one of them, knoweth and seeth them all, according to that saying of Christ to Philip, "He that seeth me, hath seen the Father." John xiv. 9. *Three there are, and yet one; thus they have read in the Scriptures, and this they testify they have had truly opened to them by that very Spirit which gave forth the Scriptures, insomuch that they certainly know it to be true, and own the thing from their very hearts: but as for this title of sacred Trinity, they find it not in Scripture, and they look upon Scripture words as fittest to express Scripture things by. And surely if a man mean the same thing as the Scripture means, the same words will suffice to express it: but the Papists and schoolmen having missed of the thing which the Scrip-*

tures drive at—have brought forth many phrases of their own invention to express their apprehensions by, which we confess we have no unity with, &c.*

The italics in the above passage distinguish as usual, what is suppressed by Verax; his animadversion upon Vindex for omitting to inform his readers, either what Isaac Penington did, or what he did not admit from this text (1 John v. 7), reverts therefore upon himself, and consequently his assertion, that he has given Penington's explanation of the text in his own words, is not correct; for he has omitted part both of 'what I. P. did, and of what he did not believe.' From the context it appears, that Penington's strictures were only directed against the scholastic definitions of the Trinity, and against imposing them upon others as a fundamental doctrine. I fully accord with Penington, that 'the true trial of spirits is not by an assent to doctrines, but by feeling them in the inward virtue of the light, in the spirit, and in the power.' It is upon this principle that a mere assent to doctrines is not sufficient for an admission into the Society of Friends. The remarks of Verax upon the 'liberal sentiments of our honourable elder,' are quite irreverent to Hannah Barnard's case, for she was not silenced for rejecting the school terms, distinct and separate persons, &c. as applied to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and objected to by Penn, Penington, and Claridge; indeed the rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity, as I have before hinted, page 8, does not constitute one of the charges against her; besides there is a great difference between not having the understanding fully enlightened respecting the truths of Scripture, and an endeavour to subvert these truths as impositions on mankind. I much approve of true liberality of sentiment, and should be pleased to discover more of it among the advocates of the Socinian scheme, for notwithstanding their high professions of it, it is much wanting among them.

Isaac Penington, in an epistle to professors, explaining himself upon two or three things, begins thus: 'The first is concerning the Godhead, which we own, as the Scriptures express it,—in which "There are Three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, and these Three are one." 1 John v. 7. This I believe from my heart, and have infallible demonstration of; for I know three, and feel three in spirit, even an eternal Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; which are but one eternal God. And I feel them also one, and have fellowship with them in their life, and in their redeeming power.—Now consider seriously, if a man from his heart believe thus concerning the eternal power and Godhead;

* Penington's Works, Quarto Edit. Vol. I. p. 264, 265.

‘ that the Father is God, the Word God, the Holy Spirit God, and that these are one eternal God; waiting so to know God, and to be subject to him accordingly; is not this man in a right frame of heart towards the Lord in this respect ?’* &c.

This passage shows Penington to have been no Socinian, either in the ancient or modern sense of the word; it likewise proves that he did not believe in three Gods, but only in ‘ one eternal God,’ being an advocate for the divine unity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and therefore no Arian, viz. one who believes the Son and Holy Spirit to be created, and inferior to the Father.

Verax’s observations on Isaac Penington’s belief in the Divinity of Christ, are preceded by some quotations from two Essays of Richard Claridge, viz. one on the Trinity, the other on the Satisfaction of Christ, to which I have before adverted, see pages 5, 6, and 44, 45. Although Verax is obliged to allow that Claridge believed in the doctrine comprised in the controverted text of 1 John v. 7. instead of informing us how to reconcile this belief with a disbelief in the Trinity, he diverts our attention with some extracts from the Essay on the Trinity, explanatory of the various significations of some school terms, the admission or rejection of which does not affect the point in question.

The conclusion Verax draws from these extracts, viz. that the adoption of the school terms mentioned by Claridge, is essential to a belief that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one God being built upon a false hypothesis, we shall pass them by, and proceed to Claridge’s treatise entitled, ‘ An Essay on the doctrine of Christ’s Satisfaction.’ Vindex, in his Examination of the Appeal, has given two or three extracts from this work, which are animadverted on by Verax, in his Vindication. My letter to John Evans, page 6, contains the first of these extracts pretty entire, with its context: the texts referred to by Claridge, I omitted only for brevity. That ‘ the holy One of Israel,’—the ‘ one God,’—‘ the only true God,’ &c. &c. is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, I apprehend will be acceded to by every Trinitarian, and denied by every Unitarian. Claridge’s adoption of these texts in support of the unity of the holy Three, deprives the Socinian of his imagined exclusive right to them, but cannot prove Claridge to have been a Socinian.

Verax says, that in the Essay on the doctrine of Christ’s Satisfaction, R. Claridge ‘ ably and strenuously defends that part of The Sandy Foundation shaken, which relates to this subject :’ does it therefore follow that either Penn or Claridge were Unitarians? he also plays upon what Vindex says respect-

* Penington’s Works, Vol. II. p. 615.

ing the supposed inconsistency of Penn's 'Sandy Foundation' shaken,' with his 'Innocency with her open Face;' whereas he and Vindex do not seem materially to vary on this point: they both admit 'the continual consistency of Penn's real opinions,'* and neither of them claim, perfect consistency as relating to the precision of his language,† only they differ in their attempts to reconcile those two works with each other. If Vindex had not thought the former work fit to be defended, is it probable he would have attempted its defence?

The doctrine refuted by W. Penn is 'the vulgar doctrine of satisfaction, which supposing Christ to have suffered the penalty of infinite wrath and vengeance, and wholly paid for us in our room and stead, viz. for all our sins, past, present, and to come, makes the discharge absolute and immediate, and so no conditions to be necessarily required on our parts, in order to the partaking of' the benefits of Christ's death.'‡ Claridge vindicates Penn's refutation of this doctrine, against the exceptions of Francis Bugg, which are as follows.

'See William Penn's book, entitled, "*The Sandy Foundation shaken, or, those so generally believed and applauded doctrines of one God, consisting of three distinct and separate persons refuted,*" &c. p. 12. The same reasserted, p. 16. "*The vulgar doctrine of Satisfaction being dependent on the second person of the imagined Trinity refuted.*" By those two propositions, it appears to me that 'the Quakers deny the Trinity, and the satisfaction made for the sins of mankind,' Quakerism drooping, p. 92, 93. To which Claridge replies, 'That which W. P. refuted, was not the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, &c.'§ as in my letter to J. E. p. 5. Verax having faithfully followed the example of F. Bugg, in confounding the perversions of doctrines with the doctrines themselves, I shall transcribe Claridge's animadversions on this mode of affixing charges on him and his friends.

'As to the doctrine of Christ's satisfaction for the sins of mankind, that we unfeignedly embrace according to the Scriptures; and therefore F. B. hath done us wrong in saying the contrary of us. If he had had any regard to truth, and intended to have dealt plainly in the controversy, he should have distinguished between the vulgar doctrine of satisfaction, which, as stated by W. P. and asserted by some of our adversaries, we do not receive, and the doctrine of satisfaction according to the Scriptures, which we do receive. But instead of this, he conceals the account W. P. gives of the

* Examination by Vindex, p. 2. † Vindication by Verax, p. 13.

‡ Claridge's Life and Posthumous Works, p. 446.

§ Ibid. p. 421.

‘vulgar doctrine of satisfaction, which carries its confutation with it, and cites only the title of that section, where it is set down and refuted, and then concludes, we deny the satisfaction made for the sins of mankind; whereas if he had dealt fairly by us, and concluded as he ought to have done, his conclusion should have been, that we deny the vulgar doctrine, and nothing else; for the premises will bear no other conclusion according to the true and just rules of reasoning; so that his conclusion is fallacious and sophistical, and proves no more against us than that we deny the vulgar and erroneous doctrine of satisfaction. And here I would expostulate a little with him and his attestators.* Is it fair to say, ‘That because the Church of England, denies the Antinomian notion of justification, she therefore denies justification itself?—or, because she denies the Pelagian doctrine of free will, she denies all free will?’

‘As this would be unreasonable, to draw such inferences against their church, because she denies the aforesaid doctrines; so I would have them consider of the unreasonableness of their concluding as they have done against us, in the point of satisfaction. For that which we deny, in reference to Christ’s Satisfaction for the sins of mankind, is the impossibility of God’s pardoning of sin upon repentance, without a plenary satisfaction to his vindictive justice, by inflicting the penalty of infinite wrath and vengeance on Jesus Christ, the second person of the Trinity, who, for sins past, present, and to come, hath wholly borne and paid it, whether for all or some, to the offended infinite justice of his Father. This is that which we deny, because it is repugnant to the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures,’ &c. &c.†

The above passages exhibit pretty accurately the state of the controversy between R. Claridge and F. Bugg; but Verax has given us neither of them, although he has made selections close upon each.

‘In the following passage,’ says Verax, ‘Claridge in effect disclaims the doctrine of the atonement, when he says of Christ, “Nor did he so substitute or put himself in the sinner’s stead, as to take the sinner’s guilt upon him, make it his own, and suffer the *idem*—which was due to the sinner: for if the very same had been paid, saith Bishop Stillingfleet, in the strict sense, there would have followed a deliverance *ipso facto*.”’‡

Verax omits after the word *idem*, ‘or the very same eternal punishment,’ neither has he done Claridge’s quotation from

* And Imitators. † Claridge’s Works, p. 438, 439, 440.

‡ Vindication, p. 75, 76.

Stillingsfleet justice, for after the words *ipso facto*, it proceeds thus, “ for the release immediately follows the payment of the same : and it had been injustice to have requested any further, in order to the discharge of the offender, when strict and full payment had been made of what was in the obligation. But we see that faith and repentance, and the consequences of those two are made conditions on our parts, in order to the enjoyment of the benefit of what Christ hath procured ; so that the release is not immediate upon the payment, but depends upon a new contract made in consideration of what Christ hath done and suffered for us.”

The next quotation from Stillingsfleet by Claridge, of which Verax has only given a fragment, concludes with these words, “ The foundation of this mistake lies in the consideration of punishment, under the notion of debts, and that satisfaction therefore must be by strict payment in rigor of law.”* Then follows another quotation given by Verax, which I shall transcribe with its context. ‘ As it was the main design of Christ’s life, doctrine, and miracles, to call men to repentance, faith, and obedience, so it was also the great end of his sufferings and death to accomplish the same glorious design.’ So far Verax. But Claridge proceeds, ‘ For he “ gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from the present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father,” Gal. i. 4. He loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word ; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy, and without blemish,” Eph. v. 25, 26, 27. He gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works,” Tit. ii. 14. This was the principal end of his giving himself for us, or offering himself a sacrifice of propitiation for the sins of mankind,’ &c.†

After an extract from Bishop Fowler, in confirmation of the above, Claridge points out the consequences of the Antinomian doctrine of Satisfaction, by some extracts from Dr. Crisp, who says, “ The new covenant is without any conditions whatsoever on man’s part,” &c. also that “ Christ doth justify a person before he doth believe.”‡ And after proving the repugnance of these notions to Scripture, and that the new covenant is conditional, Claridge adds, ‘ But though the new covenant is conditional, yet we do not understand that repentance, faith, and obedience, are such conditions as give right to eternal life and salvation, as a reward due in a way of merit, either of

* Claridge’s Works, p. 443, 444.

† Ibid, p. 446.

‘ congruity, or of condignity : for nothing that we can do, can
 ‘ possibly deserve so inestimable a blessing ; it being conferred
 ‘ merely of God’s free grace and mercy in and through his Son
 ‘ Jesus Christ, upon our repentance, faith, and obedience : but
 ‘ we understand them to be such necessary qualifications of the
 ‘ subjects of Christ’s kingdom, as that without them no man can
 ‘ enter therein ; and these not performed by our own
 ‘ strength, but by the power of Christ in us, without whom we
 ‘ can do nothing that is acceptable to God. We do not there-
 ‘ fore say that good works are meritorious of eternal life, as the
 ‘ Papists do ; but we say they are acceptable to God through
 ‘ Jesus Christ, who alone works in the faithful to will and to
 ‘ do that which is good ; and it is not of man’s merit, but of
 ‘ God’s infinite mercy, that he is pleased to reward them.*

He confirms these sentiments by further extracts from Bishops Fowler, Burnet, Dr. Hammond, and Archbishop Tillotson. The following is from Fowler.

“ Christ died to put us into a capacity of pardon ; the actual
 “ removing of our guilt is not the necessary and immediate
 “ result of his death, but suspended till such time as the afore-
 “ mentioned conditions,” (faith and obedience) “ by the help of
 “ his grace, are performed by us.” The next is from Burnet,
 who says, “ The death of Christ is proposed to us as our sacri-
 “ fice and reconciliation, our atonement and redemption. But,
 “ this reconciliation, which is made by the death of Christ,
 “ between God and man, is not absolute and without condi-
 “ tions ; he has established the covenant, and has performed all
 “ that was incumbent on him, as both the priest and the sacrifice,
 “ to do and to suffer ; and he offers this to the world, that it
 “ may be closed with by them, on the terms on which it is pro-
 “ posed ; and if they do not accept it upon those conditions,
 “ and perform what is enjoined them, they can have no share
 “ in it.”†

The extracts from Dr. Hammond and Tillotson are of a similar import. Will Verax now venture to assert, that because R. Claridge, Bishops Fowler and Burnet, Dr. Hammond, and Archbishop Tillotson refuted the *Antinomian* doctrine of the atonement, that thereby they disclaimed the doctrine of the atonement *itself*?

The reason assigned by Verax for introducing the doctrine of satisfaction is, that Vindex represents our early Friends as ‘ advocates for the “ notion of a satisfaction for sins by a vicarious atonement.” Where he has made this discovery does not appear, for the extract he has produced from a manuscript, entitled ‘ Considerations considered,’ will not authorize such a

* Claridge’s Works, p. 449. † Ibid. p. 451, 452.

conclusion : the doctrine contained therein, has the sanction of no less an author than I. Penington, from whose works it is taken, being as follows.

‘ I have had experience of that despised people for many years, and I have often heard them, (even the ancient ones of them) own Christ both inwardly and outwardly : yea, I heard one of the ancients of them thus testify, in a public meeting many years since, that if Christ had not come in the flesh, in the fulness of time, to bear our sins in his own body on the tree, and to offer himself up a sacrifice for mankind, all mankind had utterly perished. What cause then have we (adds Penington) to praise the Lord God for sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for what his Son did therein,’ &c.*

Here is not a word on vicarious atonement, not a word about appeasing a vindictive wrath in God against man. Nevertheless two very important truths of the gospel are embraced in this short extract, viz. the fall of all mankind through Adam, and the impossibility of their recovery from the effects of the fall, but through Christ as their Redeemer and Regenerator ; consequently all mankind must have perished, if some remedy had not, by the goodness of God, been provided for them. But these truths being Anti-socinian, Verax endeavours to affix them to ‘ nobody knows whom,’ rather than to Isaac Penington, who has manifestly inserted them, because adopted by himself and his friends ; although he did not think it needful to name the person whom he heard deliver them in a public meeting. Verax says, ‘ Far different from this, more sound, rational, and scriptural were the sentiments of our early and best writers.’† If Penington be not one ‘ of our early and best writers,’ where are we to look for them ? Whether the notions of Verax are ‘ more sound, rational, and scriptural’ than the ‘ sentiments of our honourable elder,’ I leave for others to determine.

There is another extract from R. Claridge in the *Vindication*, too important to pass over unnoticed ; the first part of it relates to the atonement and satisfaction of Christ for the sins of mankind, and would have contained the following passages if it had been given correct ; the roman characters distinguish what is quoted by Verax.

‘ *For since Christ was made sin, or a sacrifice for sin for us,* 2 Cor. v. 12. “ *And bore our sins in his own body on the tree.*” 1 Pet. ii. 24. Yet he “ *did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.*” ver. 22. *and therefore* ‘ suffered for sins,” &c. as Verax has it, who proceeds with an immaterial omission until he comes to this passage, ‘ *We do believe, that he suffered under Pontius Pilate,*

* Penington’s Works, Vol. II. p. 248.

† Vindication, p. 73.

*“ was crucified, dead and buried, that “ he is the propitiation for our
“ sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.”
“ That it is through his blood that we have redemption, even the for-
“ giveness of sins. Col. i. 14. We do believe, that as “ he was
“ delivered for our offences, so he was raised again for our
“ justification,” Rom. iv. 25. And “ ever liveth to make
“ intercession for us.” Heb. vii. 25.**

Without enquiring into Verax's reasons for suppressing what is in italics, or discussing how we are to interpret the words of the apostle Paul, I shall quote what immediately follows the above in Claridge, as it is cited by Verax, with the comments of the latter upon it.

“ We do also believe that he was and is both God and man, in
“ wonderful union; not a God by creation or office, as some
“ hold,† nor man by the assumption of an human body only,
“ without a reasonable soul as others;‡ nor that the manhood
“ was swallowed up of the Godhead, as a § third sort grossly
“ fancy: but God uncreated.” Here Vindex concludes the
“ quotation, but Claridge adds, “ See John i. 1, 2, 3.” pro-
“ bably referring to the ancient approved English Bible, which
“ in this place represents the word as an attribute, not a think-
“ ing intelligent being. His next reference is to Col. i. 17.
“ And he is before all things, and in him all things consist.”
“ As the two next verses will show the subject on which the
“ apostle is speaking, and elucidate the meaning of this, I add
“ them, “ And he is the head of the church, he is the beginning,
“ the first-born from the dead, that in all things he might have
“ the pre-eminence; for it pleased *the Father*, that in *him* should
“ *all fulness dwell.*” From these, and the other texts which
“ Claridge quotes in this place, I conceive he meant no more
“ by the passage selected by Vindex, than that God was in
“ Christ, although it must be owned, he has not therein adhered
“ to the rule he had himself laid down, on the propriety of using
“ only Scripture terms; for we may search in vain for any text
“ that asserts Jesus Christ to be “ God uncreated.”||

This is a specimen of Verax's polemical talents—modesty cannot be said to be a prominent feature in his character, when, to support his cause, he thus bids defiance to all sound criticism. ‘He,’ whom Claridge calls ‘both God and man,’ is admitted by Verax to be Christ; he is indeed compelled to admit it, as no other construction can be put on the passage. At

* Claridge's Life and Works, p. 441.

† “ Arians and Socinians.” ‘This is Claridge's Note, as Vindex observes, and I add, it is totally inapplicable to Unitarians’ (Verax's Note).

‡ Apollinarists.

§ Eutychians.

|| Vindication, p. 75.

the words ‘God uncreated,’ he observes, ‘Here Vindex concludes the quotation, but Claridge adds, “See John i. 1, 2, 3.” Does he intend by this that Vindex had any design in not inserting a reference to a text completely anti-Socinian? Verax introduces it in order to inform us that Claridge probably referred ‘to the ancient approved English Bible.’ If R. Claridge had this ancient version in his view, would he not have said so, as he must have known that without such an intimation, the generality of his readers would have recourse to the common version; and are not all his quotations from Scripture in this work, taken from King James’s translation? ‘The other texts which Claridge quotes’ are represented as illustrative of the import of the part ‘selected by Vindex.’ Why then are they not produced? why have we not the whole of this excellent passage of Claridge? (for which see page 6); wherein after saying that Christ is ‘the true God,’—‘the great God,’ &c. he adds, ‘And man conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. See Luke i. 31. 35.’

Verax surely cannot be ignorant that even the modern Socinians, who assume the name of Unitarians, allow that the Scriptures call Christ God, in such a limited metaphorical sense, as only implies that he is the highest, and most excellent of created Beings: their predecessors, who also called Christ God, did not by that word understand supreme, undivided divinity, but a delegated power. That Claridge, not unacquainted with these glosses of the Socinians, [adopts the term *uncreated*, to prevent any such interpretation of his meaning, appears, not only from the context, but also from the note, which is more applicable to the modern Socinians than Verax wishes his readers to think. If his quarrel with the phrase *God uncreated*, as applied to Christ, is only because not a ‘scripture term,’ why has he himself applied to the Father the phrase, ‘the *uncreated* cause of all things?’ one is as unscriptural as the other. If he object to it, because it necessarily implies Christ to be the *uncreated* cause of all things, he must either strike Claridge off his list of Unitarians, or allow that he has written nonsense.

Richard Claridge says that Christ *is both God and man,—God uncreated,—and man conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary*. Could stronger and more definite terms be chosen! Produce the Socinian who will subscribe to this description of Christ, as implying no more than that God was in Christ, in the Socinian sense of that phrase.

The first quotation from Isaac Penington on the Divinity of Christ, that claims attention, is from Vol. 2. page 8. Vindex has exposed the partiality of the selection, but as Verax says in reply to Vindex, that he cannot discover the relevance of the

part omitted by him, it seems necessary to advert to it again. I. Penington first states that some entertained 'hard thoughts 'against' the Quakers, as if they 'indeed (in effect) denied 'that Christ which died at Jerufalem,' and to obviate these objections, adds,

'To remove this out of the minds of the honest-hearted,—I 'shall open my mind nakedly herein.'

1st. 'We own that the Word of God (the only begotten 'of the Father), did take up a body of the flesh of the Virgin 'Mary, who was of the seed of David, according to the Scrip- 'tures, and did the will of the Father therein, in holy 'obedience unto him, both in life and in death.

2d. 'That he did offer up the flesh and blood of that body ' (though not only so, for he poured out his soul, he poured 'out his life) a sacrifice or offering for sin, (do not, oh! do not 'stumble at it, but rather wait on the Lord to understand it; 'for we speak in this matter what we know), a sacrifice unto 'the Father, and in it tasted death for every man; and that it 'is upon consideration, and through God's acceptance of this 'sacrifice for sin, that the sins of believers are pardoned, that 'God might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in 'Jesus, or who is of the faith of Jesus.'

3d. 'What is attributed to that body, we acknowledge and 'give to that body in its place, according as the Scripture attri- 'buteth it, which is through and because of that which dwelt 'and acted in it,' &c.

This is 'the long extract, the relevance of which' Verax 'cannot discover.' Is not our Friends' belief 'that the Word 'of God,' by whom all things were created, 'did take up a 'body of flesh of the Virgin Mary,' immediately connected with an enquiry into their belief in the Divinity and *miraculous conception* of Christ? The doctrine of the atonement and sacrifice of Christ, and its efficacy towards obtaining the pardon and remission of sins, is also acknowledged. Relevant or irrelevant, Verax has occupied whole pages on this doctrine: but he says that Vindex gives his readers a partial view of his (Verax's) quotation: perhaps Vindex thought he gave sufficient to show its connexion with the passage omitted; with regard to which passage, Verax merely informs his readers that it is irrelevant without trusting them even with '*a partial view of*' it. Does he not hereby incur the censure conveyed in these words of our Saviour, 'And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy 'brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine 'own eye?'

The criticisms of Verax, to prove that I. Penington has not opened 'his mind nakedly' in the preceding passage, and his consequent reflections on Vindex for inattention and mistake,

because he supposes Penington had, are '*such mere trifling*,' that they merit no regard.

As it is likely I may subject myself to the same censure that Vindex has incurred, by not noticing and quoting every extract, however irrelevant, that is cited by Verax; he may be informed, that if I do not, it is not from a fear of meeting them, for I believe there is no argument he has deduced from them of any weight, that is not considered in these pages; but when he quotes extraneous matter, we surely are not bound to follow him. For example, in the *Vindication*, he begins a quotation from Penington in this abrupt manner, 'Now of this thing we might speak yet more clearly and plainly, could men hear our words,' &c. This seems to refer to Christ's flesh and blood, which we feed of in the Spirit, mentioned in the paragraph that immediately precedes, but not inserted either in the *Appeal* or *Vindication*. Such strictures may expose the unfairness of the citations of Verax, but give the reader no real information.

His next quotation is from some queries in the same tract, whence the preceding one is taken. Of these queries, as Vindex observes, he 'takes the 5th, 6th, part of the 7th, 8th, 9th, 11th, and 13th. The first four speak of the satisfaction of Christ's sacrifice, and the tenth, of the pre-existent state of him, at whose name every knee is to bow. These are not favourite subjects with those who write as *Verax* does.* *Verax* complains of this reference to the first four and the tenth queries, and that those he quotes are no further noticed. The same distinction is observed in these queries between the Godhead and manhood of Christ, as in Penn's *Christian Quaker*, therefore my remarks upon one will suffice for the other, without a repetition of them. *Verax* gives the following comment on the tenth query, 'That he that was glorified of the Father, before the world was, was not the body of flesh, but the anointing, which was in the body, and appeared in it, that he might honour, glorify, and fulfil the will of the Father.† Does any Trinitarian say, that Christ's outward body was co-eternal with Christ himself? Having inserted the two comments of Vindex and *Verax* on the tenth query; they shall be succeeded by the text.

'Query 10. Who was he that humbled himself, that made himself of no reputation, that took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and found in fashion (or habit) as a man? Was it the Body of Christ, or was it he that was glorified of the Father before the world? And who is to have the honour of exaltation? At whose

* Examination of the Appeal, p. 26. † Vindication, p. 82.

'name is every knee to bow? Is not the reward to him who
'laid down his glory to take upon him the body of flesh, and
'appear in it, that he might honour, glorify, and fulfil the will
'of his Father?'

I. Penington's belief in the pre-existence of Christ is marked in characters so indelible in this tenth query, as well as in other places, that any endeavour to obliterate them will be futile. The consideration that next presents itself is, whether he believed Christ in his pre-existing state to be God, or a being endowed with a delegated power from God? for if he believed him to be God before he took upon him our nature, he must still remain unchangeably the same, the Alpha and Omega, after, as well as before he took upon him the form of a servant for the salvation of mankind. This is a consideration Verax does not fairly meet, but, if I understand him, he wishes us to take it for granted that I. Penington and his friends believed Christ to be only a man more divinely favoured than other men, and that therefore when they apply epithets to Christ, which bespeak supreme Divinity, these are to be understood not in their strict and proper sense, but with a mental reservation, as only to be understood of that divine power and virtue of the Father which revealed itself through him in a superior degree, but in the same manner as in the prophets before him. In a word, that they considered him merely as a prophet more eminently favoured than any before him had been, because the promised Messiah. But are these opinions of Christ reconcileable with a belief in his pre-existence? Do they accord with the following extract from I. Penington, in which he speaks of Christ in his pre-existent state as the supreme God? It is in a treatise entitled, 'Life and Immortality brought to Light,' &c. Section 11. 'Of the three-fold appearance of Christ, to wit, under the law, in a body of flesh, and in his spirit and power.'

'First under the law. Various were the appearances of Christ; sometimes as an angel in the likeness of a man; so to Abraham, and so to Jacob, when Jacob wrestled with him, and prevailed, and had overcome; so to Joshua, as the captain of the Lord's host, at his besieging Jericho; so to Moses in the bush, he appeared as an angel, Acts vii. 35. so likewise in visions. Those glorious appearances of God to the prophets in visions, were the appearances of Christ; as particularly that glorious appearance of God sitting upon a throne, and his train filling the temple, and the seraphim crying, "Holy! holy! holy is the Lord of Hosts; his glory is the fulness of the whole earth!" Isaiah vi.† This was an ap-

* Pennington's Works, Vol. II. p. 16, 17.

† This passage is thus rendered by Lowth,—

‘pearance of Christ to Isaiah, as is manifest, John xii. 41. ‘where the evangelist (relating to that place), useth this expression, “These things said Isaiah when he saw his glory, and spake of him.” So with the three children, he appeared in ‘the midst of the fiery furnace, “in a form like the Son of ‘God,” as Nebuchadnezzar judged. Dan. iii. 25.*

Can the least doubt remain respecting Penington’s believing Christ to be the Lord of Hosts, before he clothed himself with, or took flesh, and tabernacled with men?

‘In the passages I had quoted,’ says Verax, ‘Penington ‘speaks of Christ as the *arm* of God, the *power* of God, the ‘*Saviour* and *salvation* of God.’† If he intend to infer from these expressions that Penington could not mean Christ to be God, I cannot congratulate him for being very fortunate in his selection to prove his position. Does not David say in an address to God, ‘For they (Israel) got not the land in possession by their ‘own sword, neither did their own arm save them; but thy right ‘hand, and thine *arm*, and the light of thy countenance,’‡ &c.? Jeremiah also says, ‘Ah, Lord God, behold, thou hast made ‘the heaven and the earth by thy great power and stretched out ‘*arm*, and there is nothing too hard for thee.’§ These are sufficient to shew that *the arm of God* is a metaphor, expressive of the omnipotent creating power of the Deity, therefore not appropriate to any created being. Verax is equally unhappy in the other phrases he has selected, for in Isaiah we read, ‘I ‘even I am the Lord, and besides me there is *no Saviour*.’§ The apostle Paul says, ‘For therefore we both labour and ‘suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the ‘*Saviour* of all men.† And David, ‘The Lord is my light, ‘and my *salvation*, whom shall I fear.’** I shall close these texts with one more from Isaiah, ‘Behold God is my *salvation*, I will ‘trust and not be afraid; for the Lord Jehovah is my strength ‘and my song, he also is become my *salvation*.’†† Whether these texts convey to us the sentiment intended by I. Penington, when using the same language, may be ascertained by what he has said respecting the appearances of Christ under the law, to which I shall add some extracts from his 14th and 15th queries.

‘Holy, holy, holy, Jehovah God of hosts!

‘The whole earth is filled with his glory.’

If I had adopted this version in my quotation, instead of Penington’s, it would not have altered the sense; *the tenor of his argument fully satisfies me, that Penington understood it, in substance, as Lowth has rendered it.* These are liberties others may take with their citations from authors; I have no need of them.

* Penington, Vol. II. p. 376, 377. † Vindication, p. 82.

‡ Psalm xlv. 3. § Jeremiah xxxii. 17. § Isaiah xliii. 11,

† 1 Tim. iv. 10. ** Psalm xxviii. 1. †† Isaiah xii. 2.

‘Query 14.—Is not Christ the seed? And is not this seed sown in the heart? Now if this seed spring and grow up in me?—If I be engrafted into, and grow up in it, am I not ingrafted into Christ, the true olive tree, the true vine?—And is not this the same Christ that took upon him the body of flesh, and offered it without the gates of Jerusalem? Is there any more than one, or is there any other than he? Is Christ divided? Is there one Christ within, and another without? He that knoweth the least measure of the thing, doth he not know the thing in some measure? And he that is in the least measure of the thing, is he not in the thing? He that knoweth the Son, doth he not know the Father? And he that knoweth the Spirit, doth he not also know the Son? And he that is in the Spirit, is he not in the Son? For they are one nature and being.—And as Christ said concerning the Father, that he was in the Father, and the Father in him; and that he that saw him, saw the Father; so may it be as truly affirmed concerning Christ; that he is in the Spirit, and the Spirit in him; and he that seeth the Spirit, seeth him; and he that seeth him, seeth the Spirit. For he is the Spirit, according to that Scripture, 2 Cor. iii. 17. “Now the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.”—Here is confusion and impossibility to man’s wisdom; that Christ should be all one with the Spirit; that Christ should send the Spirit in his name, and also himself be the Spirit whom he sends. (This is an hard saying, who can bear it?) and yet this confusion to man, is God’s wisdom, and precious in their eye who are taught of him.—Now as the Father sent the Son, and yet was with and in the Son, so the Son sending the Spirit, he also is with and in the Spirit. And as it is the Father’s will that the same honour be given to the Son, as is given to him; so it is the Son’s pleasure, that the same honour be given to his Spirit as is given to him. Yea, as he that will worship the Father, must worship the Son, must come to him in the Son, must appear before him in the Son, must reverence and kiss the Son; so he that will come to Christ, will worship him, must come to him in the Spirit, must bow to him in the Spirit. Yea, he that will know and worship Christ in his fulness (in the majesty of his glory, dominion, and power), must learn to bow at the lowest appearance of his light and Spirit, even at the very feet of Jesus.’—

‘Query 15. Did not the bridegroom go away, as to his appearance in the flesh, that he might come again in Spirit? Did not the apostles, who knew his appearance in flesh, know also afterwards his appearance in Spirit? Were there not many in that day who could say concerning the spiritual and inward appearance of the bridegroom, we know

‘ that the Son of God, the eternal life, the pure power and wisdom of the Father is come?—Yea, were they not in him that is true, even in Jesus Christ the Son, who is the true God and life eternal, 1 John v. 10,’ &c. ?*

These queries immediately follow those quoted by Verax, and further illustrate their meaning; also the evidence they afford of the author’s belief in the Divinity of Christ, appearing to me indubitable and clear, I have cited them, although I may thereby incur the charge of introducing irrelevant matter, because not adapted to prove Penington a Socinian.

I shall add one more extract from this excellent treatise as a further testimony of the author’s care to express himself with all the precision, which the mysteriousness of his subject would admit.

‘ Now the Scriptures do expressly distinguish between Christ,—and the body in which he came.—“ Lo ! I come ; a body hast thou prepared me.” There is plainly he, and the body in which he came.—This we certainly know, and can never call the bodily garment Christ, but that which appeared and dwelt in the body. Now if ye indeed know the Christ of God, tell us plainly what that is which appeared in the body ? whether that was not the Christ before it took up the body, after it took up the body, and for ever ?—For Christ is the Son of the Father ; he is the infinite eternal being, One with the Father, and with the Spirit, and cannot be divided from either ; cannot—be excluded from any place where they are. He may take up a body, and appear in it ; but cannot be confined to be no where else but there, no, not at the very time while he is there: Christ, while he was here on earth, yet was not excluded from being in heaven with the Father at the same time ; as he himself said concerning himself, “ The son of man, which is in heaven ; ” John iii. 13. Nor was the Father excluded from being with him in the body ; but the Father was in him, and he in the Father ; whereupon he said unto Philip, ‘ He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father,’† &c.

The former part of this passage might probably afford Verax an opportunity to display his abilities at verbal criticism, but he has been anticipated herein by John Faldo, an ancient railing adversary of our Friends, whose objection is stated by Wm. Penn, as follows.

“ The Quakers disown, and deny the Christ of God, and set up a false Christ in his room and stead ; and attribute all to that false Christ, which is peculiar to the true Christ. This is that non-such lie, which travails to bring forth that Babel, wherewith their religion abounds.” His proof is at hand. “ This we certainly know, and can never call the bodily gar-

* Penington, Vol II. p. 17, 18, 19. † Ibid. Vol. II. p. 26.

"ment Christ, but that which appeared and dwelt in the body." Penington's *Quest.* p. 23. 32. To which he [Faldo] says, "They do not deny that there was such a man as Jesus, the son of Mary; and that God, or rather Christ was in him; but this is no more than they profess of themselves, that Christ as God, is in them; yet that body of the man Jesus, which he calls here the bodily garment, he tells us they can never call Christ." This quotation he offers at explaining by another from the same author and book, p. 20. "For that which he took upon him was our garment, even the flesh and blood of our nature."—From whence J. Faldo infers against us, "That the body, Christ took upon himself of our nature, is not the Christ."*

This is the substance of Faldo's charge against I. Penington, to which W. Penn has given a circumstantial and full answer. No doubt the form of Verax's criticism on Penington might vary from the foregoing, the point he wishes to establish being different; nevertheless, as the basis of their criticism would be the same, namely, I. Penington's distinction between the body of Christ, and the Divinity that was united to it; an answer to one will be an answer to both. And this answer being extracted from an author, whose 'fervency in the cause of truth,' Verax has represented to be such as should excite our admiration, must add to its weight with him. I shall only extract those parts of Penn's answer which appear more immediately to affect the present subject.

'—That none may be stumbled by his untrue character of us; we plainly declare—that we cannot, we dare not call the mere body, the Christ, but the body of Christ; that he was after the flesh, born of the Virgin, like unto us in all things, sin only excepted; and consequently that body must have been of the same nature with ours;—and if it had not been so, neither could it have been a garment of the nature of our flesh, —nor could the cruel instruments have prevailed against his life, as they did. And now, whether it be most against Christ, Scripture, and reason, to say, that that body, which was nailed upon the cross, was the Christ, or the body of Christ only, I leave with Christ, Scripture, and reason to determine. Certain I am—that this principle, makes a perfect difference betwixt *Him* that was before Abraham, and *Him* that said so; *Him* that told his disciples, I will not leave you comfortless, and *Him* that said I will come to you again.—But he offers to us Scripture, (Luke ii. 26, 27.) "And it was revealed to him by the Holy Ghost, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ,—&c." And it is, and will be granted,

‘ that Simeon saw the Lord’s Christ; but I hope J. Faldo will not deny unto that good man, who waited for Israel’s consolation, that he had as well a spiritual, as natural, an inward, as outward sight of Christ: for can he think, that the Word which took flesh, was nothing of that Saviour, and that the true light which then appeared, is to be excluded any share therein?—certainly this allegation from Luke ii. 26. will never prove the body of Jesus—to be the whole entire Christ, Saviour, Light, &c. unless Christ, under all these considerations, consisted of the mere outward body, that only was obvious to the outward eyes; which to affirm, were both to deny his Divinity, and to conclude Simeon void of any spiritual sight.—If to excuse the matter, he shall say, the body is only synecdochically or metonymically taken, a part for the whole, or representatively; I answer, that such a distinction overthrows him:—for if the body, which was called Jesus, and Christ, and Lord, &c. be by him allowed as representative of the whole Jesus,—what has he been opposing all this while? we will as truly and honestly say, as it is possible for him to do, that it was the body of the Lord Jesus Christ—that was born of Mary, was hanged on a tree, and laid in the sepulchre.—And if he will adventure to say more, the consequences of excluding the Divinity, and man’s soul, from being any part of the true Christ, or their mortality with the body, which are immortal, and not capable of being hanged on a tree,—will inevitably fall upon him.’*

W. Penn, also, upon the Scripture which speaks of Jesus being slain and hanged on a tree, Acts v. 31. says, that it ‘ can no more be understood strictly and entirely so, than it would be reasonable for a man to say, that when Samuel died, the soul and body which was called Samuel, died; and not rather, the body of him who was called Samuel: And this is the reason,’ adds Penn, ‘ why the Socinians, &c. hold the mortality of the soul, because otherwise those words which speak of the death of Christ, could not be taken properly, as they take and defend them.’†

This last paragraph coincides with my remarks that precede the extracts from Penn’s *Christian Quaker*, p. 46, 47. What he calls ‘ the mortality of the soul,’ is held by many, if not most, of the modern Socinians, Dr. Priestley (as I have already observed) certainly held it; see his *Disquisitions upon Matter and Spirit*.‡ After these extracts let us hope, that Verax will not

* Penn’s Works, Vol. II. p. 283, 284, 286. † Ibid. 284, 285.

‡ If we are to judge of the prevailing tenets of Socinianism, by those of any individual among its advocates, Dr. Priestley must be the man, as from the following character of him, given since his decease, he appears to be viewed as the apostle and martyr of the Socinian cause:—

persist in drawing conclusions from the distinction made by W. Penn and I. Penington between Christ and his outward body, that were never intended by them, of which distinction W. P. says in his Vindication of the work from which I last quoted, 'This distinction, friendly reader, of Christ and his body, is very unpleasant to me; but I am thrust into it by the loud clamours of our adversary against us,—as persons denying the Christ of God, because we rather choose to call that body that was prepared of God, the body of Christ, than Christ himself.*' Thus our first Friends were impelled into these subtle distinctions by the attacks of their adversaries, who opposed their doctrine of the spiritual second coming of Christ into the souls of men.

Although I do not profess to enumerate all the quotations Verax has selected, there are two, his observations on which will not permit me to pass by; the first he thus introduces,

'He was endowed with those sublime virtues which constitute the character of a reformer, and the qualifications of an apostle,—was a burning and shining light in the moral and intellectual hemisphere,—one of the most virtuous and enlightened of the human race—by his labours and his sufferings, he has done more than any single individual in his day towards dissipating the clouds of superstition, restraining the influence of inveterate and deep-rooted prejudices, clearing away the rude mass of ignorance and error under which the truth had lain for ages buried and overwhelmed, and toward re-Christianizing the world. —He endured the frightful effects of bigotry, and party rage and violence, with the constancy of a martyr, and the patience of a saint'!!! Dr. Priestley's private character may have been amiable, and he himself sincere in endeavouring to dispel what appeared to him 'the clouds of superstition,' and as such he demands our pity, as a mistaken, though well meaning man. The Sketch of Priestley's character, whence the foregoing is extracted, is so loaded with fulsome panegyric on him, and such invective on those whose principles will not permit them to view him in the same light; as being narrow minded bigots, 'enemies of free enquiry, of useful science, of sound learning, and of exalted virtue;' that we know not at which to express our surprise most; the blind partiality that has guided the pencil of the delineator in the first, or the extreme illiberality that has influenced him in the last instance.—The *religious act* that gave rise to those shameful riots at Birmingham, through which Dr. P. suffered 'the spoiling of his goods,' which we are informed he endured 'with the constancy of a martyr,' &c. was the *celebration of the anniversary of the French Revolution by the Friends of Freedom*. We cannot forbear expressing our decided disapprobation of such a profanation of the sacred cause of Christianity, by confounding it with politics. There is reason to believe that Dr. P.'s sufferings originated as much in his political, as religious principles, or else why did he leave England for America? Did the Birmingham mob follow him to London?

* Penn's Works, Vol. II. p. 419.

‘ That the reader may see more fully, how far Isaac Penington was from admitting the notion of a vicarious atonement, I shall here insert, first the argument of his opponent, in favour of that doctrine, and then Penington’s answer to it, distinguishing by italics the part Vindex has withheld from his readers.’

Waving any enquiry as to what the notion of a vicarious atonement has to do with the Divinity of Christ, I will present the reader with the passage, which Verax apprehends, illustrates Penington’s opinions on this point, inserting it as Verax has it, and his subsequent remarks thereon.

“ He saith,” ‘ says Penington,’ “ the Lord our righteousness redeems us, not properly by the life and spirit of *his* Godhead, though that was in the work, supporting, enabling him, and carrying him up, in that great undertaking; but by the death and sufferings of his manhood.”

‘ To this proposition Penington replies, “ *This is strange doctrine, to make the manhood the main Redeemer, and the life and spirit of the Godhead, but the supporter and carrier up of the man in the work of redemption; whereas* it was the Word which created all, which also redeemed—it was the spirit and life of the Father (even the eternal Son) which took up that body, appeared in that body, offered it up a pure and acceptable sacrifice to the Father, finishing the work therein, which the Father gave him to do.”*

“ Here we have Penington,” ‘ says Vindex,’ “ acknowledging the eternity of the Son, ascribing creation to him, as well as redemption, and styling him the spirit and the life of the Father.”

‘ Of Penington’s use of the word *eternal*,’ Verax observes, ‘ in a limited sense, as applied to the anointed and appointed of the Father, I have already spoken. And I should think by the context, he here uses the word *created* in the same sense as the apostle, when he says, “ For we are his (God’s) workmanship *created* in Christ Jesus unto good works.”†

Of Penington’s use of the word *eternal*, in a limited sense, I do not discover that Verax has said any thing expressly before; and to what he advances in his introduction respecting that word, I have already replied: as to the observation that by the word *created* is to be understood the *new creation* or redemption, it is repugnant to the context, which plainly distinguishes between the primeval and the new creation, for how otherwise are these words to be understood, ‘ It was the Word which *created* all, which also *redeemed*?’ Is not the first and second creation distinguished from each other in this place by the two words *created* and *redeemed*?’ ‘ Does Verax expect his readers will

* Penington, Vol. II. p. 142, 143.

† Vindication, p. 84.

‘ deem such mere trifling as this, grave, dignified criticism?’ or that they will deem Vindex’s conclusions from this passage of Penington in the least shaken by his observations on it? With respect to the doctrine of the atonement, I can discover no trace of its being questioned either by Penington, or his adversary; the latter making ‘ the manhood the main Redeemer,’ is what is objected to by Penington, in which objection I should think every true believer in the Divinity of Christ would unite. Nevertheless that the reader may see yet more fully that Penington does not deny the sacrifice and atonement of Christ, I shall insert the four first of his queries alluded to by Vindex.

‘ Query 1.—Whether there was not a necessity of Christ’s taking upon him our flesh, for the redemption of those that had sinned, and the satisfaction of the Justice offended?’

‘ Query 2.—Whether the Father did not accordingly prepare a body for him, to do his will in all things in; and particularly to offer up to him the acceptable sacrifice for the sins of the whole world?’

‘ Query 3.—Whether it was not necessary, in this respect also, that Christ should take upon him our flesh, that he might have experience of our temptations and infirmities, and become a merciful and faithful high-priest, and intercessor for us?’

‘ Query 4.—Wherein lay the value and worth of his sacrifice, and of all he did? did it lie chiefly on the thing done, or in the life wherein he did it, in that he did it in pure faith and obedience to the Father? he became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; and he, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God?’*

To these queries I shall add a passage from ‘ An Epistle to all Serious Professors,’ &c. wherein ‘ concerning the offering of the Lord Jesus Christ, without the gates of Jerusalem,’ Penington says:

‘ I do exceedingly honour and esteem that offering, believing it had relation to the sins of the whole world, and was a propitiatory sacrifice to the Father therefore. And surely he that is redeemed out of the world up to God by Christ, cannot deny that Christ was his ransom, and that he was bought with a price, and therefore is to glorify God, with his body and spirit, which are God’s, 1 Cor. vi. 20. And, saith the apostle Peter, ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation, &c. but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot, 1 Peter i. 18, 19. who so offered himself up to God through the eternal Spirit, Heb. ix. 14.’†

* Penington, Vol. II. p. 15.

† Ibid. Vol. II. p. 615, 616.

The other quotation from Penington, which I propose noticing, is in the same work as the first, and I shall insert it, like the former, as given by Verax in his 'Vindication,' including his remarks.

'Penington states his opponent's argument thus: "I firmly believe, and so have all the saints that have gone before, *that Christ is a person*, and his spirit a living principle in the hearts of all the faithful; but it is not the spirit or principle in us, that did redeem us, but the man Christ Jesus."

'To which Penington replies, "*If he mean by the man Christ Jesus, the second Adam, the quickening Spirit, the Lord from heaven, he who is one with the Father, the Word which was in the beginning, and created all things, I grant him to be the Redeemer; for it was he who laid down his glory, wherewith he was glorified before the world was, and made himself of no reputation, but took upon him the form of a servant, and came as a servant, in the fashion of a man, to do the will!*"* But if he distinguish Christ from this Word and Spirit, and make the man's part the Saviour, and the Godhead only assistant to him,—that I utterly deny." 'So far only Vindex gives of my quotation. 'The remainder of it is plainly expressive of the belief of the author in the supremacy of the Father, and is as follows: "For so testifieth the Scripture, *I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour, I am a just God, and a Saviour, &c.* So that Christ is the Saviour as he is one with God. It was God's arm and power (revealed in him), that effects salvation. Yea, if I may so speak, his obedience was of value, as it came from the Spirit, and it was the *offering it up through the eternal Spirit*, that made it so acceptable to God. So that we must not attribute redemption originally to him as a man, *but as he came from God*; and bring the honour all back to the spring and fountain from whence *he had all, that God may be all in all*, and the very kingdom of Christ may endure, and abide for ever, in the root of life from whence it came."†

'If these sentiments,' (adds Verax), 'be not most decidedly Unitarian, I have learned from my youth to affix very erroneous ideas to some of the most common words in the English language.'‡

The extract from Penington is first divided into two parts by Verax, and then his remarks upon it are confined to the latter part of the disjointed paragraph, whereas the whole is necessary to be considered to ascertain the author's meaning.—But before

* The part preceding is omitted in the Appeal.

† Penington, Vol. II. p. 154, 155.

‡ Vindication, p. 84. 85.

we notice the conclusions Verax has drawn from Penington's words, it will be proper to consider the nature of his opponent's argument, who first asserts "that Christ is a person, and his "Spirit a living principle in the hearts of all the faithful." Secondly, That "it is not the Spirit or principle in us, that did "redeem us, but the man Christ Jesus."

Penington in his reply only notices the second branch of this proposition, because he had already said sufficient on the first branch of it in the paragraph that immediately precedes; in which answering his opponent's objection, which implied that I. P. considered Christ only as a principle, he says,

'There is a difference between the light which enlighteneth (the fulness of light, which giveth the measure of light, the measure of anointing to us) and the measure, or proportion which is given; the one is Christ himself, the other is his gift; yet his gift is of the same nature with himself, and leavens those that receive it, and abide in it, into the same nature,'* &c.

Thus Penington makes a clear and specific distinction between Christ as he is the eternal Son, who created all things, and in whom dwells the fulness of light and life; and that *principle of light or grace*, which *out of his fulness*, he bestows upon every man to redeem him from the fall, and which from the oneness of its nature with him from whom it proceeds, is called 'Christ within the hope of glory:' so that it cannot be said 'that on the subject of Christ' Penington has '*sheltered himself behind the broad shield of allegory.*' In reply to the second branch of his opponent's proposition, Penington says he will accord with him therein. 'If he mean by the man Christ Jesus, the second Adam,—the Lord from heaven,—the Word which—created all things,—who laid down his glory, and came in the fashion of a man,' for, says Penington, 'I grant him to be the Redeemer,' and then proceeds to prove that if Christ was not himself God as well as man, but that the manhood was only assisted by God, he could not be the Saviour of mankind; this he supports by that Scripture, "*I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour, I am a just God and a Saviour.*" So that Christ is the Saviour, as he is one with God, as he came from God,' from whence the manhood had all its virtue and power.

Until Verax proves that Penington did not believe Jesus Christ, whose body was crucified without the gates of Jerusalem, to be the *Redeemer* and *Saviour* of mankind, the extract he has pronounced to be 'most decidedly Unitarian,' must be considered as containing the most irrefragable proofs, that its author believed Christ to be truly and properly God.

* Penington's Works, Vol. II. p. 154.

I shall take leave of Penington with giving the reader his views of the state of man in the fall, and his natural inability to deliver himself, or even to take a single step towards his salvation.

‘The fall of man from God is such,’ (says Penington) ‘that it hath benumbed all his senses; yea, so bereft him of them, that he cannot feel his own estate. He is dead, spiritually dead, and can no more feel his death, his spiritual death, than a man naturally dead can his natural death.—Men speak of the relics of the image which the first man had: ah! poor deceived hearts! what relics of life are there in a dead man! What relics of purity in a man wholly degenerated and corrupted? Nay, nay; the spiritual image, the divine image, the eternal life, the pure power and virtue, is wholly lost, and there is nothing left, but what is captivated and destroyed through the degenerating power.—So that it is impossible for fallen man to attain to so much as one true breathing or desire after God again; this must arise from the grace, from the mercy, from a new begetting (by the free gift) towards life, towards the divine image again; which was slain in man (and the impression of it on him wholly lost) ever since the foundation of the world in his heart.—The wound of man is deep by the fall; he hath really lost God—yea, in that estate he is altogether without hope (for the hope springs from God’s visitation of him with his light, and from the living promise), That which recovers man, is the eternal virtue, the endless power, the life immortal, the Christ of God.’*

In ‘some propositions concerning the only way of salvation,’ Penington observes ‘that there is no way of being saved from sin, and wrath eternal, but by that Christ alone which died at Jerusalem. There is no name, virtue, life, or power under heaven given, by which lost man may be saved, but his alone.’†

I have now closed my examination of the extracts from Penn, Barclay, Fox, and Penington, adduced, in the first part of the Appeal, and Verax’s Vindication of it, to prove their faith to be what is now called Unitarian.

The concluding remarks upon the Divinity of Christ in the ‘Appeal’ and the ‘Vindication,’ proceed entirely upon the supposition, that a rejection of the phrase of ‘three distinct and separate persons’ involves in it a disbelief in the proper Divinity of Christ. This is at best but begging the question, by taking for granted what will not be allowed. For does it follow because Verax thinks he sees an inconsistency in the belief of one, and rejection of the other, that therefore our first Friends must have seen the same inconsistency? one thing is

* Penington’s Works, Vol. I. p. 336, 339.

† Ibid. p. 78.

certain, namely, that their present successors do not see this inconsistency which Verax pretends to discover; for they reject the phrase in question, when speaking of the Trinity, whilst they unequivocally believe in the proper Divinity of Christ. Proof of this has been sufficiently given by their recent conduct.

That the reader may yet further be convinced that the Quakers are not singular in supposing that a belief in the Trinity is not necessarily connected with an adoption of the metaphysical terms of the schools, upon which Verax lays the whole stress of this argument, I shall add the testimonies of Maclaine and Stillingsfleet to that of Calvin given in page 45.

‘It is,’ says A. Maclaine, ‘but too evident, that few controversies have so little augmented the sum of knowledge, and so much hurt the spirit of charity, as the controversies that have been carried on in the Christian church, in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity. Mr. Whiston was one of the first divines who revived this controversy in the 18th century.’—Dr. Samuel Clarke stepped also aside from the notions commonly received concerning the Trinity; but his modification of this doctrine was not so remote from the popular and orthodox hypothesis, as the sentiments of Whiston.—The learned Dr. Waterland was one of his principal adversaries, and stands at the head of a polemical body of eminent divines, —who appeared in this controversy. Against these, Dr. Clarke, unawed by their numbers, defended himself with great spirit and perseverance, in several letters and replies. This prolonged a controversy, which may often be suspended through the fatigue of the combatants, or the change of the mode in theological researches, but will probably never be terminated; for nothing affords such an endless subject of debate as a doctrine above the reach of the human understanding, and expressed in the ambiguous and improper terms of human language, such as *persons, generation, substance*, &c. which in this controversy either convey no ideas at all, or false ones. The inconveniences, accordingly, of departing from the divine simplicity of the Scripture language on this subject, and of making a matter of mere revelation an object of human reasoning, were palpable in the writings of both the contending parties. For if Dr. Clarke was accused of verging towards Arianism, by maintaining the derived and *caused* existence of the Son and Holy Ghost, it seemed no less evident that Dr. Waterland was verging towards Tritheism, by maintaining the *self-existence* and *independence* of these divine persons, &c.’

‘The difference between these two learned men lay in this, that Dr. Clarke, after making a faithful collection of the texts in Scripture that relate to the Trinity, thought proper to

‘interpret them by the maxims and rules of right reasoning, that are used on other subjects; whereas Dr. Waterland denied that this mode of reasoning was to be admitted in illustrating the doctrine of the Trinity, which was far exalted above the sphere of human reason, and therefore he took the texts of Scripture in their direct, literal, and grammatical sense. Dr. Waterland however employed the words *person*, *substance*, &c.—The Doctor indeed apologizes in his queries, (page 321) for the use of these metaphysical terms, by observing, that “they are not designed to enlarge our views, or to add any thing to our stock of ideas, but to secure the plain fundamental truth, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are all strictly divine and uncreated, and yet not three Gods, but one God.” It is, however, difficult to comprehend how terms that neither enlarge our views, nor give us ideas, can secure the truth. It is difficult to conceive what our faith gains by being entertained with a certain number of sounds. If a Chinese would explain a term of his language which I did not understand, by another term, which he knew beforehand that I understood as little, his conduct would be justly considered as an insult against the rules of conversation and good breeding; and I think it is an equal violation of the equitable principles of candid controversy to offer as illustrations, propositions or terms that are as unintelligible and obscure as the thing to be illustrated. The words of the excellent and learned Stillingfleet (in the Preface to his Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity), administer a plain and a wise rule, which, were it observed by divines, would greatly contribute to heal the wounds which both truth and charity have received in this controversy.’

“Since both sides yield,” (says he) “that the matter they dispute about, is above their reach, the wisest course they can take, is, to assert and defend what is revealed, and not to be peremptory and quarrelsome about that which is acknowledged to be above our comprehension; I mean as to the manner how the three persons partake of the Divine nature.”*

No Society of Christians has more endeavoured to adhere to this ‘plain and wise rule,’ here recommended, than the Society of Friends. Their belief in the Trinity R. Claridge has expressed in terms even less exceptionable than those of Stillingfleet, viz. ‘That there is the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, as in 1 John v. 7. (though in some very ancient copies this verse is omitted), or, the Father, the Son, and the

* Mosheim’s Ecclesiastical History, Octavo Edit. Vol. VI. p. 40 to 44. Note (2)

‘Holy Ghost, as in Matth. xxviii. 19. And that these Three are One, we truly believe; but dare not take upon us to declare how they are One, and how they are Three, any otherwise than we find it already declared in express scripture terms: and that for this reason, because they are safe and orthodox.’*

Speaking of our Friends’ rejection of the phrase ‘distinct and separate persons,’ Verax says, ‘They patiently bore the calumnies that were most industriously circulated against them on that account; among which the charge of Deism was one of the most common, as well as one of the mildest, by which they were characterized,’ &c.† In this I must dissent from Verax, unless the charge of *Deism* be milder than that of *Socinianism*. If by patiently bearing ‘the calumnies circulated against them on that account,’ he means that they did not repel those charges, it is a mistake; the charge of *Socinianism* was pointedly and professedly repelled by W. Penn, in his ‘Innocency with her open Face,’ and in his ‘Spirit of Truth vindicated;’ by Robert Barclay, in his Vindication of his Apology; and by Geo. Whitehead, in his Treatise on the Divinity of Christ. After W. Penn’s decease, the charge of *Deism* was brought against him and his friends, which was refuted by Joseph Bessé, in his work entitled, *A Confutation of the charge of Deism, wherein the orthodox sentiments of Wm. Penn are fully demonstrated by extracts from his own writings*, printed 1734; and by Alexander Arscott, in the third part of his *Considerations relating to the present state of the Christian Religion*, &c.

The evidence produced in the preceding pages, authorizes me to adopt the closing paragraph of Vindex upon this subject, as still retaining its full force, viz. that if Verax ‘have been labouring to prove that our ancient Friends did, and that Friends now should, reject the term person, in speaking of the Son, considered as the Word, the Light, the Redemption, he seems to me to be fighting a man of straw. But if he mean to prove that our ancient Friends, allowing Penn, Barclay, Fox, and Penington, to be fair specimens of them, denied the eternal Divinity of Christ,‡ and refused him the tribute of adoration, (rejecting also the idea of a Holy Three, as mentioned in Scripture), I hope the foregoing pages will indisputably show that he has not established his point.||

* *Melius Inquirendum*, or an Answer to E. Cockson, 1706. p. 13.

† Appeal, p. 23.

‡ Verax in the Introduction to his Vindication, endeavours to evade the real import of this phrase, the fallacy of which attempt has been noticed in page 39.

|| Examination, p. 27.

CHAP. V.

ON THE SCRIPTURES.

Introductory Remarks.—RICHARD CLARIDGE'S *Traſtatus Hierographicus*; or a *Treatiſe concerning the Holy Scriptures.*—ROBERT BARCLAY'S *belief in the authenticity and inſpiration of the Scriptures, illuſtrated by divers extraſts from his Works.*—*Objections answered.*

OUR early Friends reſuſed to call the Scriptures the Word of God, or to allow them to be the primary rule of faith and manners—the firſt term they applied to Chriſt; the ſecond, to the law written by his Spirit in the heart. Their adverſaries, on that account, repreſented them as denying the Scriptures, and rejecting their divine authority. Before we adduce their defence of themſelves againſt theſe falſe aſſertions, which will alſo vindicate their ſucceſſors from the reflections of Verax and his co-adjutors; we will give what they do believe concerning the ſacred writings, in the form of a few propoſitions, which, to obviate all objections as to their accuracy, are in the words of Richard Claridge.

‘ We do ſincerely and unfeignedly believe the following Propoſitions.’

‘ 1ſt. That the *holy Scriptures* of the *Old and New Teſtament*, were not of any men’s * *private ſetting forth*, but were given by *Inſpiration of God.*’

‘ 2d. That they do contain a clear and *sufficient declaration* of all doctrines, in common to be believed, in order to eternal life and salvation.’*

‘ 3d. That the *Holy Scriptures* are the best outward *rule* and *standard of doctrine and practice*.’

‘ 4th. That whatsoever either *doctrine* or *practice*, though under pretensions to the *immediate dictates* and teachings of the Spirit, is contrary to the *Holy Scriptures*, ought to be rejected and disowned as false and *erroneous*: for “whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an *Article of Faith*.” See Art. 6. of the Church of England.’

‘ 5th. That the *Holy Scriptures* contain the sayings or words of God; are *divine writings*, which claim the † precedence of all others; and we do esteem them as such ourselves, and under this character recommend them to others.’

‘ 6th. That there ever was, and is, a most sweet *concord* and *harmony* between the teachings of the Spirit and the testimony of the *Holy Scriptures*; and that there is no *inconsistency* or *contradiction* between the one and the other, notwithstanding the great diversity of men’s opinions and sentiments, under the profession of Christianity. For we do believe, that if pride, prejudice, and self-interest were laid aside, and men would, in humility of mind, sincerity of heart, and abasement of self, wait upon the Lord for the teachings of his Spirit, they would be taught by him the very truth as it is in Jesus, and come to know that blessed and heavenly unity in the things of God, from which they are now so divided and subdivided both among themselves, and in opposition to one another.’

‘ 7th. That though the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man, both Jew and Gentile, to profit withal, and the grace of God which bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men, so that all have means sufficient afforded them for their present and eternal welfare—yet it is a great mercy to us, and

* “*Quod sine Scripturâ asseritur, aut revelatione probatâ, opinari licet, credi non est necesse.*” Whatsoever is asserted without the Scripture, or approved revelation, may pass for an opinion, but is not necessary to be believed.” ‘Luther. Tom. II. 277. a.’

† “*Historie sacrarum Bibliorum antecellunt omnium aliarum gentium historiis.*” The histories of the Holy Bible excel the histories of all other nations.” ‘Luther. in Gen. 35.’

“*Scriptura, summæ dispositione providentiæ, super omnes omnium gentium literas, omnia sibi genera ingeniorum humanorum, divinâ excellens autoritate subjecit.*” The Scripture by the disposition of sovereign Providence, excelling all the learning of all nations, in its divine authority, hath prevailed upon men of all sorts.” ‘Aug. 11. de Civit. Dei. c. 11.’

‘all those that make a right use of it, that it hath pleased God
 ‘to afford unto us the Holy Scriptures, which he hath with-
 ‘held from many others: And we do believe, that having the
 ‘*advantage* of the *Holy Scriptures*, more is required of us, than
 ‘of those to whom they are not *communicated*; for to whom
 ‘much is given, from them much is required.’

‘8th. That as the Holy Scriptures have God alone for their
 ‘Author, so the Spirit of God alone is their certain and infal-
 ‘lible interpreter.* For except the Spirit which he hath
 ‘promised, and we ought to wait for, expound them to us,
 ‘we can never spiritually or savingly understand or apply them.
 ‘The certain knowledge therefore, and understanding of them,
 ‘must be waited for, of the same Spirit by which they were
 ‘dictated, and committed to writing.’†

These propositions of Richard Claridge give a comprehensive view of our first Friends’ belief in the Scriptures; they are also perfectly coincident with what Robert Barclay has written on the same subjects. To obviate any difficulty that may be started, however needlessly, respecting their import, I shall anticipate the question, *In what sense is Claridge here to be understood?* it being necessary to ascertain with precision and accuracy what our first Friends did believe, before we discuss what they did not believe, respecting the Scriptures.

The first proposition mentions, 1st. The object of belief, viz. the *Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament*. If Claridge, had only said the *Holy Scriptures*, the reasonable and natural construction would be that he thereby understood the whole of the books which are known by that appellation, beginning with *Genesis* and ending with the *Revelation*; but his object being ‘the silencing of cavilling and calumniating adversaries,’ he prevents even the bare possibility of misconstruction by adding *of the Old and New Testament*. Having clearly defined the object, the proposition states, 2dly. What is the Society’s belief respecting them, viz. ‘That they were *not of any man’s private setting forth, but were ‘given by inspiration of God.’* This being as it were the basis of the succeeding propositions, it is important to understand in what sense the word *inspiration* is used by

‘* “*Scripturæ non nisi eo Spiritu intelligendæ sunt quo scriptæ sunt.*
 ‘The Scriptures are not to be understood, but by the same Spirit by
 ‘which they were written.” ‘Luther. Tom. II. 309. a.’

‘“*Spiritus requiritur ad totam Scripturam, & ad quamlibet ejus partem
 ‘intelligendam.* The Spirit is required to the understanding of the
 ‘whole Scripture, and of every part thereof.” Ibid. Tom. III.
 ‘169. a.’

† ‘*Traſtatus Hieroglyphicus; or a Treatiſe of the Holy Scrip-
 ‘tures,*’ by Richard Claridge. See Introduction.

our Friends, when applied to the whole of the Scriptures, it being used in the same extensive sense by R. Barclay, W. Penn, and others.

The believers in the divine authority and inspiration of the whole of the Scriptures may be divided into two classes. 1st. Those who believe in the plenary or organic inspiration of the sacred writings, viz. ‘that the writers were but the passive organs through which every word and letter were conveyed.’ 2d. Those who, rejecting the idea of plenary or organic inspiration as unnecessary and superfluous, believe that in a certain true sense the Scriptures may be said to be ‘given by the inspiration of God,’ because written by holy men of God that were inspired by the Holy Ghost; and who, although it is unnecessary to suppose they were intuitively or organically inspired, when relating historical facts of which they were eye-witnesses, were nevertheless preserved by the Holy Spirit from falling into any material error, even in the detail of historical facts; so as to give in simplicity and sincerity, without any gloss or concealment, the errors and vices, as well as the virtues, of the most exalted characters they describe; and that the practical and doctrinal truths inculcating virtue and piety interpersed in the historical narratives were immediately dictated by the Holy Spirit. The late W. Warburton, Bishop of Gloucester, has so judiciously distinguished between these two ideas of *inspiration*, that I shall adopt his words. Speaking of the New Testament he says,

—On the whole then, we conclude, that all the Scriptures of the New Testament were given by inspiration of God.—It remains only to be considered, in what sense we are to understand this *inspiration*? A spurious opinion, begotten in the Jewish church by superstition, and nursed up by mistaken piety in the Christian, hath almost passed into an article of faith, “That the language of Scripture was dictated by the Holy Spirit in such sort that the writers were but the passive organs through which every word and letter were conveyed.”—But there are many objections to that idea of organic inspiration, which mistaken piety hath adopted. 1. It would be putting the Holy Spirit on an unnecessary employment; for much of these sacred volumes being historical, and of facts and discourses which had fallen under the observation of the writers, they did not need his assistance to do this part of their business for them. 2. Had the Scriptures been written under this organic inspiration, there must have been the most perfect agreement amongst the four evangelists, in every circumstance of the smallest fact. But we see there is not this perfect agreement. In some minute particulars, which regard neither faith nor manners, neither the truth nor certainty of the history in general, the several writers vary from one another. A vari-

'ation, which, though it discredits the notion of an organic
 'inspiration, yet (which is of much more importance) supports
 'the fidelity of the historians; as it shows that they did not
 'write in concert, or copy from one another; but that each
 'described the proper impressions which the same facts had
 'made upon himself. 3. Were this the true idea of scripture
 'inspiration, that each writer was but the mere organ of the
 'Spirit, the phraseology or turn of expression had been one and
 'the same, throughout all the sacred books written in the same
 'language: whereas we find it to be very different and various,
 'always corresponding to the conditions, tempers, and capacities
 'of the writers. 4. Lastly, the very words of Scripture must,
 'in this case, have been preserved, throughout all ages, perfectly
 'pure and free from the corruptions and mistakes of transcribers.
 'For if it were expedient, useful, and fortifying with the views of
 'divine wisdom, that every word and letter should be inspired,
 'it was equally expedient that every word and letter should be
 'preserved incorrupt; otherwise the Holy Spirit would appear
 'to have laboured in vain. Now general experience assures us
 'that this is not the case: frequent transcribing hath occasioned
 'numerous variations in words and phrases throughout all the
 'Scriptures of the New Testament. But though this opposes
 'the notion of organic inspiration, yet the harmless nature of
 'the variations, which never disturb the sense, nor obscure a
 'single proposition of faith, or precept of good manners, affords
 'a noble instance of the gracious providence of God, in bringing
 'down to us those Scriptures destined for an infallible rule, in-
 'corrupt, and entire in all essential and even material points.'—
 'It is of little consequence to us to be instructed how or in what
 'manner the truth came to be secured; whether by direct inspi-
 'ration, or by that virtual superintendence of the Spirit, which
 'preserved the writers of it from error:—so long as we are
 'assured that Divine Providence guarded its delivery from all
 'approach of error. But then let us observe that this is a very
 'different thing from the ORIGIN of the Truths themselves; for
 'on this latter, the reality of our religion, indeed, depends; the
 'very nature of it consisteth in this, that the doctrines which it
 'teacheth be not only truths SIMPLY, but truths REVEALED
 'from heaven. And indeed, even with regard to the *delivery*,
 'when the writers propose any thing of *faith* or *practice*, explan-
 'atory of what their master taught, and not explicitly contained
 'in his words, we must needs conclude, that so far they were
 'under the immediate direction of the Holy Spirit, who was
 'to teach them all things; and this influence the apostle calls
 'speaking by revelation.*

'This is the language of one that held up the Scriptures as the only infallible rule of faith and manners: and if he rejected the plenary or organic inspiration of the Scriptures, is it to be supposed that our Friends (who consider the Spirit of Christ revealing itself in the heart of man, as the primary, infallible rule of Christians, and the Scriptures only secondarily, as 'the best outward rule and standard of doctrine and practice,') adopt, not to say enforce, the idea of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures? No, such a belief was never required of Hannah Barnard, and I conceive when R. Claridge, R. Barclay, and W. Penn denominate the whole of the Scriptures inspired writings, they use the word inspiration according to the second definition of that term, which; whilst it establishes the divine authority and inspiration of the sacred writings, is not clogged with the difficulties attending the idea of an organic inspiration, from 'the numerous variations in words and phrases throughout the New Testament, in consequence of frequent transcribing,' noticed by Barclay, as well as by Warburton, the former also agreeing with the latter, that these variations do not affect any of the essentials of the Christian faith, so as to prevent the Scriptures from being *the only fit outward judge of controversies among Christians*.

After expressing in the three first propositions our Friends' belief that the Scriptures were given by the inspiration of God, and that they are a '*Rule and Standard of Doctrine and Practice*,' R. Claridge, in the fourth proposition, adds, 'That whatsoever either doctrine or practice, though under pretensions to the immediate dictates and teachings of the Spirit, is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, ought to be rejected and *disowned* as false and erroneous.'—This proposition claims our serious attention, as containing within itself a justification of the basis of the late proceedings of the Society against Hannah Barnard, whose doctrines were so far from being in *concord and harmony with the Scriptures*, that she would not even acknowledge her belief in their veracity; she had therefore some reason for evading to give a direct reply to the following question put to her by the respondent, when her case was brought before the yearly meeting: 'Wilt thou consent to have the matters in dispute tried by the Scriptures, considered as a true record?' to which she replied, 'I am very willing that all my sentiments, as well as practice, should be tried by the rational, consistent doctrines contained in the Scriptures, as the same are stated in a small pamphlet, published by the approbation and sanction of the morning meeting in London, &c.' The question has been called unfair, as taking for granted the very subject in dispute. I conceive the point to be ascertained was, whether H. B.'s sentiments were in unison with those of the Society.

Now R. Barclay says, *That we never shall refuse in all controversies, that all our doctrines be tried by the Scriptures as the judge and test.* If her doctrines were the same as R. Barclay's, why hesitate to suffer them to be tried by the same judge and test? If she knew them *not* to be the same as his, she was wilfully imposing on the Society. It was impossible for the respondent's question to be couched in less exceptionable terms; it did not demand a belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures; it did not oblige her to commit herself as to the accuracy of our English translation, but left her at liberty to object to any corruptions that she could prove had crept into it; whence then could proceed her reluctance to admit an appeal to the Scriptures for the truth of her doctrines, unless from a consciousness of the contrariety of her doctrines to them, and an unwillingness to acknowledge the Scriptures to be even a true record? Could our Society avoid, when one of its ministers not only propagated sentiments which it considers repugnant to the sacred writings, but even endeavoured to undermine their divine authority; could it, I say, consistently with its repeated declarations to the world, that it rejected and disowned all doctrines that are contrary to the Scriptures, avoid testifying its public disapprobation of such conduct? The pamphlet, under the sanction of which H. Barnard endeavoured to conceal her scepticism, was not written to disprove the authenticity of the Scriptures, or that they are not a proper judge and test of controverted doctrines; but to prove that they are not 'the living, ancient, unalterable, universal rule, viz. the Spirit, light, or grace, of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.' Was such a belief ever demanded of H. B.? Let the respondent's question be an answer to this; it was of a very different complexion from the question she put to him, namely, 'I now ask J. G. Bevan a question in my turn, which is, Whether he believes the whole of the Scriptures, from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelations, as we have them translated, to be pure, consistent truth?' the captious design of this question is too obvious to need exposure, for the most trifling error that affects neither faith nor manners, would prevent an unqualified assent to it.

Claridge, in his seventh proposition, after having represented all men as being placed, through the grace of God, in a capacity for salvation, adds, 'yet, it is a great mercy to us—that it hath pleased God to afford unto us the Holy Scriptures, which he hath withheld from many others: And we do believe, that having the advantage of the Holy Scriptures, more is required of us, than of those to whom they are not communicated, for to whom much is given, from them much is required.' It is for want of preserving the distinction here made between the different degrees of faith or belief

required of men, in order to their salvation, according to the various degrees of light afforded them, that Hannah Barnard and her advocates have so perverted the sense of Barclay, Penn, Morris, &c. on the subject of faith. Will Verax assert that no greater degree of faith or belief is required of those who have the advantage of the Scriptures, than of those from whom they are withheld? or, that the faith of the last is all that is essentially necessary, to become a member of a Christian society?

The eighth and last proposition expresses briefly that fundamental principle of our Friends, 'That as the Holy Scriptures have God alone for their Author, so the Spirit of God alone is their certain and infallible interpreter,' and that they do receive and believe the Scriptures, because they proceeded from the Spirit; wherefore the Spirit is more originally and principally the Rule; for maintaining which, they 'have been greatly misrepresented as contemners of the Holy Scriptures;' and these calumniators have met with an ally in Verax, who, under the mask of a defence of the primitive simplicity of the Christian principles of the Society of Friends, has, in fact, renewed the attack. The fallacy of the arguments he has adduced, I trust, it will not be difficult to detect; in the prosecution of which, the preceding eight propositions will be confirmed by extracts from the authors selected by Verax.

In the Appeal, the subject of our Friends' belief, or rather disbelief, respecting the Scriptures, is introduced with these words, 'Exclusive of the refusal of our early Friends to admit, in any sense, the doctrine of personal distinctions in the Deity, hardly any of their testimonies gave more offence, or occasioned them to be more vilified and abused, than their objecting to call the Scriptures the Word of God, &c.*'

No reason being assigned by Verax for our Friends objecting to call the Scriptures by that phrase, I shall give one in the words of Robert Barclay, who, in reply to an adversary, on this subject, says, 'Though the Scripture be a declaration of God's mind, yet it is not his Word properly.—The Word of God is like unto himself, spiritual, yea, Spirit and life, and therefore cannot be heard or read with the natural, external senses, as the Scriptures can, nor do the Scriptures cited by thee—prove thy intent: For that Word which came unto the prophets, was that from which the Scriptures were given forth, which Word you confess was immediate from God.—And did not all the prophets prophesy from *Christ*, the *Word*.—And whereas thou sayest, *It is all one to say, the Scripture saith, and God saith.* Ans. By way of inference and collection it may be said they are one, because of their agreement, yet the living

‘ Word and speech of God is not the Scripture, more than the sun-beam is the shadow, though the one agrees with the other.— And truly, the reason why we may not call the Scriptures the Word of God, (to speak properly) is, that people may be directed to that inward, living Word; for by their being so much called the *Word of God*, they have been put in Christ’s stead, and have been set up as an idol, instead of that from whence they came; so that to avoid this hazard, we have put them in their due place.’*

And in his Vindication of his Apology against John Brown— ‘ He’ (Brown) ‘ digresseth to prove *the Scriptures to be the Word of God*: but if they be granted to be the *words of God*, (which no Quaker that ever I knew of, did or will deny) wherein are they derogated from, since they are many words, and not one? But if he will plead, they are the *WORD of God* *καὶ ἐξοχῶν*, or, *per eminentiam*: to say so, seeing the Word of God is ascribed to Christ, must either equal them with him, or speak nonsense; seeing that one epithet cannot be predicated of two things *καὶ ἐξοχῶν*, without a gross contradiction. That the word of the Lord came to the prophets, and that what they spake was the *words* that came from that *Word* is granted, nor was it ever denied by us, who are against all false revelations, and lying fancies of men’s imaginations, as much as he,’ &c.†

Barclay’s admitting the Scriptures to be called the *words of God*, and that they proceed from Christ, as the eternal Word, removes every suspicion of his or his friends’ intention to derogate from their divine authority by refusing to call them ‘ the Word of God *per eminentiam*.’ But our Friends’ refusing to allow the Scriptures to be ‘ the adequate, primary rule of faith and manners,’ has been a more prominent cause of the calumnies cast upon them, by their enemies, as depreciating the sacred writings. And this is the point which occupies the more argumentative part of the third Proposition of Barclay’s Apology, against those that set up the Scriptures as the only rule of Christians, in opposition to the law written in the heart by the immediate teachings of the Spirit of Christ; consequently his arguments tend to prove the superiority of this instruction *immediately* received from the Holy Spirit, to that only *mediately* received from outward writings, although immediately dictated by the same Spirit. If we do not therefore meet with ‘ the most elaborate part of Barclay’s argument,’ when expressing his belief in the inspiration and divine authority of the Scriptures, it is not because he did not fully believe in them, but

* Barclay’s Works, Fol. Ed. p. 14, 15.

† Ibid. p. 747.

because it was superfluous on points wherein both he and his opponents were agreed.

I unite with Verax that Barclay's third Proposition affords 'an able and consistent view of the subject,'* but I cannot grant that Verax's 'view of the subject' is very consistent with the manifest drift of this proposition. By extracts from it I shall endeavour to remove the obloquy which, notwithstanding his fair pretensions, and his pretended admiration, is by him indirectly cast on Barclay. These extracts will also prove Barclay an able and consistent writer, so that there will be no danger of his appearing in one place to deliver 'a distinct and separate aphorism,' which would make him 'directly contradict what he had just before bestowed much sound argument to establish.'†

'As it will not be questioned, but Barclay wrote his *Apology* to explain and defend his theses; and that the knowledge of the text is necessary to the right understanding of the 'explanation of the text;' my extracts from him shall be introduced by his thesis on the Scriptures, which, following that concerning immediate revelation, begins thus :

'From these revelations of the Spirit of God to the saints, have proceeded the SCRIPTURES of TRUTH, which contain, 1. A faithful historical account of the actings of God's people in divers ages; with many singular and remarkable providences attending them. 2. A prophetic account of several things, whereof some are already past, and some yet to come. 3. A full and ample account of all the chief principles of the doctrine of Christ, held forth in divers precious declarations, exhortations, and sentences, which by the moving of God's Spirit were at several times, and upon sundry occasions, spoken and written unto some churches and their pastors. Nevertheless, because they are only a declaration of the Fountain, and not the Fountain itself, therefore they are not to be esteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the adequate, primary rule of faith and manners; yet because they give a true and faithful testimony of the first foundation, they are, and may be esteemed a secondary rule, subordinate to the Spirit, from which they have all their excellency and certainty. For as by the inward testimony of the Spirit we do alone truly know them; so they testify that the Spirit is that guide, by which the saints are led into all truth; therefore according to the Scriptures, the Spirit is the first and principal leader. Seeing then, that we do therefore receive and believe the Scriptures, because they proceeded from the Spirit; for the very same reason is the Spirit more originally and principally the

* Vindication, p. 92.

† Appeal, p. 30.

* rule, according to that received maxim in the schools, *Propter quod unumquodque est tale, illud ipsum magis est tale*: That for which a thing is such, the thing itself is more such.*

That Barclay meant by the Scriptures of Truth, the whole of the books of the Old and New Testament, agreeably to R. Claridge's first proposition, must be admitted by every one who would not impeach his veracity; and these writings, he says, proceeded from the Spirit of God. In what sense this inspiration is to be understood, when extended, as in the present instance, to the historical, as well as the prophetic and doctrinal parts of the Scripture, has been already shown.

Verax will probably call these *general expressions*, because they include the whole of the Bible, and therefore not sorting with his notions of discrimination and selection: but they are too clearly descriptive of the sentiments of Barclay, to be easily evaded by forced inferences drawn from those other passages, which Verax has described as containing 'a more full and definite explanation of the author's sentiments.' The passages to which he alludes were not intended by Barclay as explanatory of the former, but of the latter part of the thesis, which sets forth the superiority of the *immediate* revelation of the Spirit, to the *mediate* revelation of it through the Scripture. This will appear from the first section of this proposition, which begins thus.

§ I. The former part of this Proposition, though it needs no apology for it, yet it is a good apology for us; and will help to sweep away that among many other calumnies, wherewith we are often loaded, as if we were vilifiers and deniers of the Scriptures. For in that which we affirm of them it doth appear, at what high rate we value them, accounting them without all deceit or equivocation the most excellent writings in the world, to which not only no other writings are to be preferred, but even in divers respects not comparable thereunto. For as we freely acknowledge, that their authority doth not depend upon the approbation or canons of any church or assembly; so neither can we subject them to the fallen, corrupt, and defiled reason of man: and therein as we do freely agree with the Protestants against the error of the Romanists; so on the other hand, we cannot go the length of such Protestants, as to make their authority to depend upon any virtue or power that is in the writings themselves: but we desire to ascribe all to that Spirit, from which they proceeded. We confess indeed, there wants not a majesty in the style, a coherence in the parts, a good scope in the whole; but seeing these things are not discerned by the natural, but only by the spiritual

‘man, it is the Spirit of God, that must give us that belief of
 ‘the Scriptures, which may satisfy our consciences: therefore
 ‘the chiefest among Protestants, both in their particular
 ‘writings and public confessions, are forced to acknowledge
 ‘this.’*

Part of this quotation is the first that appears in the *Appeal* on this subject, the principal variation of the statement in that work from the sense of the Apologist is noticed by Vindex; the part I advert to is, where Verax says, ‘but they’ (Friends) ‘ascribed all to that Spirit from whence *the more excellent parts thereof*’ (i. e. of the Scriptures) ‘proceeded,’† Barclay’s words are, ‘but we desire to ascribe all to that Spirit, from which they ‘proceeded.’ In his *Vindication* Verax remarks, that Vindex charges him ‘with being at variance with Barclay on the subject, although’ (says he) ‘I had therein expressed only his professed sentiments. If Barclay really believed that the whole of the Scriptures “proceeded from the Spirit,” as Vindex would persuade us he did, he must of course have believed, that “the “more excellent parts” were derived from that source. In the passage in question, I have said nothing of the origin of any other parts of those writings, some of which I am aware it may be difficult to trace, but as far as I have expressed my sentiments in this passage, I conceive they are in strict, and even literal accordance to those of Barclay.’‡

This curious apology demands some attention; Verax says, ‘as far as I have expressed my sentiments in this passage.’ Why did he give us his own sentiments instead of Barclay’s words? Is it reasonable after this to insinuate that Vindex has subjoined his own explanation of Barclay’s text, when his explanation is in the *express words* of the apologist? Is the same deference shewn for the apologist in the *Appeal*, when its author imposes his own comment upon us without subjoining the text, until the strictures of an opponent oblige him to produce it? If a phrase expressive of hesitation and doubt on a subject, is in *strict and literal accordance* with one, in which no such hesitation and doubt appears, then Verax has indeed expressed Barclay’s *professed sentiments*. In support of his half acquiescence in this passage he says, ‘Does not Barclay in this very proposition speak of the spiritual senses of Christians, “by which they know how to discern the *true* from the *false*?”’ And as he applies these terms to the present canon of Scripture, do they not make a wider distinction than my expressions implied? since he refers to whole books of doubtful authenticity, and among others, to the Revelations, “which many

* Barclay’s Apology, p. 68, 69. † Appeal, p. 24.

‡ Vindication, p. 90, 91.

“writers,” ‘says he,’ “even very ancient, deny to have been written by the beloved disciple and brother of James, but by another of that name.” ‘And this opinion,’ (adds Verax) ‘is supported by some of the most learned men of the present age, in biblical knowledge. But whether the apocalypse be a genuine, or spurious book, what enlightened advocate for the divine mission, and gospel of Jesus Christ, would represent the latter, as standing on no better internal or historical evidence than the former?’*

Thus Verax grasps at every phantom that appears to him likely to weaken the authenticity of the Scripture; if he had mentioned the names of his ‘most learned men of the present age, in biblical knowledge,’ we could have better judged whether the weight due to their criticisms would overpower the authority of the united testimonies of Justin Martyr, Irenæus,† Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, Clemens of Alexandria, and Tertullian, all writers at or before the commencement of the third century. Against the testimonies of his modern ‘learned men,’ the following one from the learned Doddridge may be adduced.

‘Dr. Mill observes that in a few years after it [the Revelation] was written, it was numbered among the *apostolical* writings, by the churches of Asia, the neighbouring churches of Syria, and Samaria, the more distant ones of Africa, Egypt, and Rome, and the other churches of Europe. Accordingly Mr. Lowman, citing this remark of Dr. Mill, makes the following additional observation, “that hardly any one book hath received more early, more authentic, or more satisfactory attestations.”‡

It is not difficult to ascertain what would be the fate of this, and many other parts of Scripture, if subjected to Verax’s mutilating tribunal: but our present enquiry does not so immediately respect the authenticity of the Scriptures, as our early Friends’ belief in them.

In the last extract I have given from Barclay, he says, ‘We freely acknowledge that their [the Scriptures’] authority doth *not* depend upon the approbation or canons of any church or assembly;—but we desire to ascribe all to that Spirit, from which they proceeded.’ And after producing testimonies from Calvin, the confessions of faith of the French churches, of the churches in Holland, and of the Westminster divines (so

* Vindication, p. 91.

† This ancient father was a disciple of Polycarp, who had been a disciple of the apostle John himself.

‡ Doddridge’s Family Expositor, Vol. 6. p. 357. 8vo Edit.

called), to prove that the certainty of the Scriptures is from the Spirit, he proceeds as follows.

‘By all which it appeareth how necessary it is to seek the certainty of the Scriptures from the Spirit, and no where else: the infinite janglings and endless contests of those that seek their authority elsewhere, do witness to the truth hereof. For the ancients themselves, even of the first centuries, were not agreed among themselves concerning them; while some of them rejected books which we approve, and others of them approved those which some of us reject. It is not unknown to such as are in the least acquainted with antiquity, what great contests are concerning the second epistle of *Peter*, that of *James*, the second and third of *John*, and the Revelations, which many, even very ancient, deny to have been written by the beloved disciple and brother of James, but by another of that name. What should then become of Christians, if they had not received that Spirit, and those spiritual senses, by which they know how to discern the true from the false? It is the privilege of Christ’s sheep indeed that they hear his voice, and refuse that of a stranger; which privilege being taken away, we are left a prey to all manner of wolves.’* In the margin Barclay inserts the following note, &c. ‘Apocrypha.—Concil. Laod. Can. 59. in Cod. Ecc. 163.—Concil. Laod. held in the year 364, excluded from the Canon Eccl. the *Wisdom of Solomon*, *Judith*, *Tobias*, the *Maccabees*, which the council of Carthage held in the year 399, received.’

If the authority of the sacred writings depended wholly ‘upon the approbation or canons of any church or assembly,’ these differences between the councils would, no doubt, more or less affect the authority of those books, respecting which they differed; but Barclay says, *their authority doth not depend upon these canons*. The contests between the councils are produced by him, not to invalidate the authority of ‘the present canon of Scripture,’ but to prove the uncertainty that attends resting its authority upon the decisions of councils, whereas by the evidence of the Spirit of God we know how to discern ‘the true from the false,’ the genuine authentic Scriptures, from Apocryphal writings. Barclay gives not the least hint that ‘he applies both these terms true and false to the present canon of Scripture,’ but contrariwise; for speaking of those parts of it that some of the ancients rejected, he calls them ‘*Books which we approve*,’ and it was the council of Carthage held in the year 399 that ‘approved those, which *some* of us reject.’—So that the distinction made by H. B. and her advocates be-

* Barclay’s Apology, p. 70.

tween the *true* and *false* in the present canon of Scripture, is a distinction of their own, not authorized by Barclay.

That the reader may not be ignorant of H. Barnard's manner of quoting Barclay, to prove the coincidence of sentiment *between him and herself*, I shall give a specimen of her perversion of the passage now before us; it is in a "Sequel to the Appeal," lately published.

A Friend speaking of the Scriptures, in reply to H. Barnard's assertion that Robert Barclay called the authenticity of some parts of them in question, is represented by her as saying, "No! Robert Barclay does not call their authority in question in the least, but fully admits it, in every essential point; for I have lately perused him on the subject; and the Society have always been uniform in their full belief in them." 'I was surpris'd,' (says H. Barnard) 'at his language, and replied, Barclay's words, as near as I can remember, are, "The difficulties and uncertainties in ascertaining the original meaning of the authors, and whether they have been truly and faithfully translated and transcribed, are so many, and so great, that it leads the minds *even* of the learned, into infinite doubt, perplexity, and uncertainty. And unless we examine them, individually, by the light which God has endowed us with, we cannot possibly distinguish the true from the false in them; and if this privilege is relinquished, or by any means taken from us, we shall be left a prey to all manner of wolves."*

The first part of this quotation, or rather paraphrase, is from the fourth section of Barclay's third Proposition, page 81 of the Apology, and the latter part which is from the passage I have just cited, is in the first section, page 70. This is *one* way of quoting an author; it reminds me of an anecdote respecting a person, who, satirizing another for wresting scripture, by quoting insulated texts, without regarding their context, said, it is written that Judas 'went and hanged himself,' it is also written, 'Go thou and do likewise,' offering to prove it from scripture. I do not infer that Hannah Barnard's paraphrase does equal violence to Barclay's meaning, although advanced to make him appear to controvert a sentiment which he has openly avowed, viz. that he fully admits the authority of the Scripture in every essential point. Inaccuracy in citing a passage of an author from memory is possible, but when we commit it to paper and publish it, such inaccuracy, and the occasion of it, should be noted that the reader may not be misled by it; which Verax has not done, either in this place, or in the examination of Hannah Barnard and the respondents before the committee of appeals (see page 168 of the Appeal), where a

* Sequel to the Appeal, p. 55, 56.

similar error also occurs. Well might J. G. Bevan say to such a false citation, that if it proved any thing, it could only prove that Robert Barclay was not one of the Society; it could not possibly prove that she was one of them: the truth is, he did not consider that it proved any thing, because false, and therefore, as he observed, ‘nothing to her purpose,’ but thence to charge him with condemning R. Barclay as ‘not one of the Society’ is mere trifling, and only merits contempt.

Barclay’s Catechism will also further prove that he had no intention of questioning the authority of those books mentioned by him as rejected by some of the ancients, it is entitled, *A Catechism and Confession of Faith approved of and agreed unto by the General Assembly of the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, Christ himself chief speaker in and among them; which containeth a true and faithful account of the principles, &c. believed by the churches of Christ—called Quakers,—most clearly demonstrated by some plain scripture testimonies, &c.* From this sketch of the title we may safely conclude that R. Barclay considered every book he has quoted in this work as authentic, and not apocryphal; although it by no means follows that he rejected those books of the Scripture he had no occasion to refer to. The second epistle of Peter, that of James, and the Revelation of John, are repeatedly referred to by Barclay in his Catechism, as *scripture testimonies*; the second and third epistles of John being very short, and only to individuals, may account for his not having citations from them. Verax must first overturn this weight of evidence, before he again ventures to represent Barclay as applying the term *false* to *whole books* of the *present canon of Scripture*.

When pressed very closely with Barclay’s *real* opinions, Verax informs us, that he ‘cannot implicitly receive all his sentiments ‘as just, or consider every text he may have quoted, as therefore genuine, and authentic Scripture.’ I believe nobody wishes him implicitly to receive the opinions either of *Barclay* or of *Priestley*, if at variance with Scripture and the revelation of the Spirit of Christ in the heart: but rather that he would rank himself under his proper colours, and not counterfeit the Quaker, when in reality a *Socinian*; and whilst he continues such, we neither expect, nor desire to discover much agreement between him and Barclay, neither shall we hesitate to prefer the judgment of the latter, to ascertain whether our early Friends believed the present canon of Scripture ‘to be genuine, decisive, and fit to ‘judge controversy by.’

The second, fourth, and sixth sections of Barclay’s third Proposition, whence the other extracts in the Appeal are selected, were written to prove what I trust no Quaker will deny; 1st. That the Scriptures are not ‘the principal ground and origin ‘of all truth and knowledge,’ nor ‘the primary rule of faith

‘and manners.’ 2dly. But that they should rank next to the Spirit, as a secondary rule, and ‘the only fit outward judge of ‘controversies among Christians,’ which he reduces to the following argument.

‘That whereof the certainty and authority depends upon another, and which is received as truth because of its proceeding from another, is not to be accounted the principal ground and origin of all truth and knowledge: but the Scriptures’ authority and certainty depend upon the Spirit, by which they were dictated; and the reason why they were received as truth is, because they proceeded from the Spirit: therefore they are not the principal ground of truth.’*

The second section begins thus, ‘Though then we do acknowledge the Scriptures to be very heavenly and divine writings, the use of them to be very comfortable and necessary to the church of Christ; and that we also admire and give praise to the Lord for his wonderful Providence in preserving these writings so pure and uncorrupted as we have them, through so long a night of apostasy, to be a testimony of his truth against the wickedness and abominations even of those, whom he made instrumental in preserving them, so that they have kept them to be a witness against themselves; yet we may not call them the principal fountain of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the first, adequate rule of faith and manners; because the principal fountain of truth, must be the truth itself, *i. e.* that, whose certainty and authority depend not upon another. When we doubt of the streams of any river or flood, we recur to the fountain itself, and having found it, there we desist; we can go no further; because there it springs out of the bowels of the earth, which are inscrutable: even so the writings and sayings of all men we must bring to the Word of God, I mean the eternal Word, and if they agree hereunto, we stand there. For this Word always proceedeth, and doth eternally proceed from God, in and by which the unsearchable wisdom of God, and unsearchable counsel and will conceived in the heart of God, is revealed unto us.’†

Would Barclay call the Scriptures *very heavenly and divine writings*; would he praise the Lord for *preserving them so pure and uncorrupted*; if he had apprehended the inadvertent errors that frequent transcribing had occasioned, so far obscured the sense of the Scriptures, as to make them assume ‘so very motley an appearance’ that even the truths they contain should be involved in uncertainty and doubt?

After observing that ‘the very nature of the gospel itself declareth that the Scriptures cannot be the only and chief

‘ rule of Christians, else there would be no difference between
 ‘ the law and the gospel,’ and that ‘ the principal rule of
 ‘ Christians under the gospel is not an outward letter, nor law
 ‘ outwardly written and delivered, but an inward, spiritual law
 ‘ engraven in the heart, the law of the Spirit of life, the word
 ‘ that is nigh in the heart and in the mouth,’ Barclay proceeds
 to shew wherein the Scriptures cannot be an adequate rule of
 conduct.

‘ For instance, some are called to the ministry of the word ;
 ‘ Paul saith, *There was a necessity upon him to preach the gospel ;*
 ‘ *woe unto me, if I preach not.* If it be necessary that there be
 ‘ now ministers of the church as well as then, then there is the
 ‘ same necessity upon some more than upon others to occupy
 ‘ this place ; which necessity, as it may be incumbent upon par-
 ‘ ticular persons, the Scripture neither doth nor can declare.
 ‘ If it be said, *That the qualifications of a minister are found in the*
 ‘ *Scripture ; and by applying these qualifications to myself, I may*
 ‘ *know, whether I be fit for such a place or not ;* I answer, ‘ The
 ‘ qualifications of a bishop, or minister, as they are mentioned
 ‘ both in the epistle to Timothy and Titus, are such as may
 ‘ be found in a private Christian ; yea, which ought, in some
 ‘ measure, to be in every true Christian ; so that this giveth a
 ‘ man no certainty. Every capacity to an office giveth me not
 ‘ a sufficient call to it.—And suppose that I was qualified and
 ‘ called, yet what scripture-rule shall inform me, whether it be
 ‘ my duty to preach in this, or that place, in France or England,
 ‘ Holland or Germany ? Whether I shall take up my time in
 ‘ confirming the faithful, reclaiming heretics, or converting
 ‘ infidels, as also in writing epistles to this or that church ? The
 ‘ general rules of the Scripture, viz. *To be diligent in my duty, to do*
 ‘ *all to the glory of God, and for the good of his church,* can give me
 ‘ no light in this thing : seeing two different things may both
 ‘ have a respect to that way, yet may I commit a great error
 ‘ and offence in doing the one, when I am called to the other.
 ‘ If Paul, when his face was turned by the Lord towards Jeru-
 ‘ salem, had gone back to Achaia or Macedonia, he might have
 ‘ supposed he could have done God more acceptable service, in
 ‘ preaching and confirming the churches, than in being shut up
 ‘ in prison in Judea ; but would God have been pleased here-
 ‘ with ? Nay, certainly. *Obedience is better than sacrifice ;* and it is
 ‘ not our doing that which is good simply, that pleaseth God ;
 ‘ but that good which he willeth us to do. Every member hath
 ‘ its particular place in the body, as the apostle sheweth, 1 Cor.
 ‘ 12. If then I, being the foot, should offer to exercise the office
 ‘ of the hand ; or being the hand, that of the tongue ; my ser-
 ‘ vice would be troublesome, and not acceptable ; and instead

‘ of helping the body, I should make a schism in it: so that
 ‘ that which is good for another to do, may be sinful to me.’*

These arguments are so conclusive, that I think there is no Christian that believes in immediate revelation, or divine influence, but must accede to the propriety of them. They clearly exhibit, that by the primary rule of faith and manners, Barclay means that inward law written in the heart, which, as attended unto, will direct man in those duties that relate to the station, Providence has placed him in, and respecting which the Scriptures cannot possibly direct him, although they may encourage and strengthen him in the performance of them, for says Barclay, ‘ God hath seen meet that herein,’ (i. e. in the Scriptures) ‘ we
 ‘ should, as in a looking-glass, see the conditions and experiences
 ‘ of the saints of old; that finding our experience answer to
 ‘ theirs, we might thereby be the more confirmed and com-
 ‘ forted, and our hope of obtaining the same end strengthened;
 ‘ that seeing the snares they were liable to, and beholding their
 ‘ deliverances, we may thereby be made wise to salvation, and
 ‘ seasonably reprov’d and instructed in righteousness.’† Thus, as without the Spirit, the Scriptures are a sealed book; the being led and guided by the Spirit of truth, is so far from precluding our receiving benefit and instruction through the instrumentality of the Scriptures, that it is then only we can truly profit by reading them.

If the Scriptures were the principal ground and origin of all truth and knowledge, what would become of thousands to whom God hath not seen meet to reveal them? Besides to suppose any outward writings to be the origin of all truth and knowledge, and to be in themselves spirit and life (whereas ‘ this
 ‘ is life eternal to know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ
 ‘ whom thou hast sent),’ is to place the origin of truth and life eternal in that which is liable to variation and error; for so it must be confessed are all outward writings. That errors, though comparatively trifling, have crept into the Scriptures, will not be denied; it is most to be admired, that they are so immaterial, as not to affect our faith and practice in any thing important or essential. This we must, with Barclay, attribute to the *wonderful providence of God*; may we therefore be sufficiently thankful unto him for having preserved them *so pure and uncorrupted as we have them*. Barclay in the fourth section points out the difficulties here stated, that attend the idea of the Scriptures being the only, principal, and chief rule; it begins thus:—

‘ §4. Lastly: That cannot be the only, principal, nor chief
 ‘ rule, which doth not universally reach every individual, that

* Barclay’s Apology, p. 74, 75, 76.

† Ibid. p. 84.

‘ needeth it, to produce the necessary effect ; and from the use of
 ‘ which—many—are necessarily excluded ; and that either wholly,
 ‘ or at least from the immediate use thereof.—Shall we then
 ‘ affirm that they are without any rule to Godward, or that they
 ‘ are all damned ? As such an opinion is in itself very absurd,
 ‘ and inconsistent both with the justice and mercy of God, so I
 ‘ know no sound reason can be alledged for it. Now if we may
 ‘ suppose any such to be under the new covenant dispensation, as
 ‘ I know none will deny, but that we may suppose it without
 ‘ any absurdity, we cannot suppose them without some rule and
 ‘ means of knowledge ; seeing it is expressly affirmed, “ They
 ‘ shall all be taught of God.” John vi. 45, &c.—Secondly,—
 ‘ how many illiterate, and yet good men are there in the church
 ‘ of God, who cannot read a letter in their own mother-
 ‘ tongue ?—these can have no immediate knowledge of the rule
 ‘ of their faith ; so their faith must needs depend upon the
 ‘ credit of other men’s reading or relating it unto them, where
 ‘ either the altering, adding, or omitting of a little word may
 ‘ be a foundation in the poor hearer of a very dangerous mistake,
 ‘ whereby he may either continue in some iniquity ignorantly, or
 ‘ believe a lie confidently. As for example ; the Papists in all
 ‘ their catechisms and public exercises of examinations towards
 ‘ the people, have boldly cut away the second command, be-
 ‘ cause it seems so expressly to strike against their adoration and
 ‘ use of images.*

This passage is not intended to detract from the utility of the Scriptures to those who can have access to them, but simply against their being considered as the only rule of faith, and Barclay’s remarks that succeed the foregoing, are to show that their exposure to error through frequent transcribing, militates against the idea of their being the principal ground and origin of all truth and knowledge, or a superior and more certain rule than the teachings of that Eternal Word from which they have all their authority and certainty, the substance of these remarks I will endeavour faithfully to transcribe.

Barclay, after showing how those who have not a ‘ thorough knowledge of the original languages in which they were written,’ must ‘ depend upon the honesty and faithfulness of the interpreters,’ adds,

‘ And that even the last translators in the vulgar languages
 ‘ need to be corrected (as I could prove at large, were it proper
 ‘ in this place), learned men do confess. But last of all, there is
 ‘ no less difficulty occurs even to those skilled in the original
 ‘ languages, who cannot so immediately receive the mind of the
 ‘ authors in these writings, as that their faith doth not at least

' obliquely depend upon the honesty and credit of the tran-
 ' scribers, since the original copies are granted by all not to be
 ' now extant. Of which transcribers Jerom, in his time, com-
 ' plained, saying, *That they wrote not what they found, but*
 ' *what they understood*; and Epiphanius saith, *That in the good*
 ' *and correct copies of Luke it was written, that Christ wept,*
 ' *and that Irenæus doth cite it; but that the Catholicks blotted*
 ' *it out, fearing lest hereticks should have abused it.* Other fa-
 ' thers also declare *that whole verses were taken out of Mark,*
 ' *because of the Manichees.* But further, the various readings
 ' of the Hebrew character by reason of the points—the dis-
 ' agreement of divers citations of Christ and the apostles with
 ' those passages in the Old Testament they appeal to; the
 ' great controversy among the fathers, whereof some highly
 ' approve the Greek Septuagint;—some others, and particu-
 ' larly Jerom, exalting the certainty of the Hebrew:—and
 ' the many various readings in divers copies of the Greek, and
 ' the great altercations among the fathers of the first three cen-
 ' turies (who had greater opportunity to be better informed, than
 ' we can now lay claim to), concerning the books to be admitted
 ' or rejected;—I say all these, and much more which might be
 ' alledged, puts the minds even of the learned into infinite doubts,
 ' scruples, and inextricable difficulties; whence we may very
 ' safely conclude, that Jesus Christ, who promised to be always
 ' with his children, to lead them into all truth, to guard them
 ' against the devices of the enemy, and to establish their faith
 ' upon an unmoveable rock, left them not to be principally
 ' ruled by that, which was subject in itself to many uncertain-
 ' ties; and therefore he gave them his Spirit, as their principal
 ' guide, which neither moths nor time can wear out, nor tran-
 ' scribers nor translators corrupt; which none are so young,
 ' none so illiterate, none in so remote a place, but they may
 ' come to be reached and rightly informed by it.*

I think the conclusion of this extract confirms the truth
 of my preceding observations respecting the particular pur-
 pose for which it was written; not to detract from the au-
 thenticity of the Scriptures, but to state the difficulties con-
 sequent upon setting up the best of writings (considering their
 exposure to error through transcribers and translators) as the
 principal guide into all truth, to the exclusion of that more in-
 fallible guide, the Spirit of Christ, who has promised to be al-
 ways with his children to lead them into all truth. Ancient
 writings generally suffer more or less by transcription and trans-
 lation; but few are known to have suffered less from the lapse
 of time than the Holy Scriptures.

Those writers who industriously collect and magnify every little difficulty respecting the present translations and the original text of the sacred records, that may have been occasionally hinted at by Barclay and other learned men, cannot be more suitably addressed on the task they have undertaken, than in the words of Robert Gray in his *Key to the Old Testament*, who speaking of King James's translation, makes some very judicious reflections:

‘The Romanists,’ he says, ‘started many unreasonable objections against this translation; and the Presbyterians professed themselves dissatisfied. It was however allowed, even by Cromwell’s committee, to be the best extant; and certainly it is a most wonderful and incomparable work, equally remarkable for the general fidelity of its construction, and the magnificent simplicity of its language. That it is not a perfect work is readily admitted; the great advancement made since the period of its translation, in the original languages; the improvement that has succeeded in critical learning,—have much tended to illustrate the sacred writings, and enabled us to detect many errors and defects of translation, that might now be corrected and removed.—Whenever, therefore, it shall be judged expedient by well-advised and considerate measures, to authorize a revival of this translation, it will certainly be found capable of many and great improvements.* As such a work, deliberately planned, and judiciously executed, would unquestionably contribute much to the advancement of true religion, many pious men have expressed their earnest wishes for its accomplishment.—Till, however, the execution of this work shall be judged expedient, every sincere and well-disposed admirer of the holy oracles may be satisfied with the present translation, which is, indeed, highly excellent; being in its *doctrines uncorrupt*, and, in its general construction, faithful to the original. The *captious chiefly, and such as seek for blemishes, are disposed to cavil at its minute imperfections*, which, however in a work of such serious and interesting value they may require correction, should not be *invidiously detailed*. The few passages, which, by being erroneously translated, have furnished occasion for *unjust and licentious aspersions against the sacred volume*, are so clearly and satisfactorily explained and vindicated by judicious comments, that no one can be misled in his conceptions, who is desirous of obtaining instruction.†

Does not Gray admit with Barclay that there are many errors and defects in our translation, and that it is capable of many and

* ‘Bishop Lloyd’s edition of our translation is improved in some respects. Dr. Paris likewise revised it in 1745.’

† Gray’s *Key to the Old Testament*, p. 41 to 44.

great improvements? It can do Verax no harm to consider, whether, by magnifying and invidiously detailing these defects, he is not 'more intent on pursuing and pressing his adversaries, 'than in securing himself an honourable retreat?'—whether he is not in effect courting the attacks of the Deist?

The inaccuracies pointed out by R. Barclay relate rather to omissions from, than additions to, the text; for example, the expunging of the second command from the decalogue, the Roman Catholics blotting out some words in Luke, also the omission of several verses in Mark, because of the Manichees. All omissions from a rule, militate against its perfection, but do not detract from the authority of what is left. The disagreement of some citations in the New Testament, with the same passages in the Old, mentioned by Barclay, is chiefly occasioned by the Septuagint or Greek version being most in use among the Jews in the time of our Saviour, and the Septuagint is known not to be in all places exactly conformable to the Hebrew.

The various readings in divers copies of the New Testament are noticed by Warburton in the passage before cited, who says, 'frequent transcribing has occasioned numerous variations in 'words and phrases throughout all the Scriptures of the New 'Testament.' But Warburton no more than Barclay, intended hereby to weaken the divine authority of the New Testament; he only opposes the idea of the organic or plenary inspiration of the Scriptures, as Barclay adopts the same argument to oppose the notion of their being 'the principal ground and origin of 'all truth and knowledge.' For the Bishop afterwards describes these variations as being of a harmless nature, and not obscuring a single proposition of faith; a similar observation is also made by Barclay in the 6th section of his third Proposition. The errors he notices, as detected by some of his friends, do not extend to the present copies of the original, but are wholly confined to our English version, and therefore of but little importance, compared with errors in the original text; for if they have not been corrected in more recent translations, a new translation of the whole of the Scriptures would probably effect this desirable object; and until then, the plain English reader, who cannot refer to the originals, may content himself with saying, 'If I shall meet with any thing in these writings that 'seemeth repugnant to truth, I shall not doubt to say, that 'either the translator hath not reached what was said; or that 'I have in no wise understood it.'

Although Verax has been liberal in his quotations from Barclay's fourth section, he silently passes over the fifth, in which an objection that might be made to the preceding one is obviated; it immediately follows the last citation from the fourth section, given in the Appeal, and begins thus:—

‘ § 5. If it be then asked me, *Whether I think hereby to render the Scripture, altogether uncertain, or useless* ; I answer: Not at all. The proposition itself declares how much I esteem them: and provided that to the Spirit, from which they came, be but granted that place the Scriptures themselves give it; I do freely concede to the Scriptures the second place, even whatsover they say of themselves: which the apostle Paul chiefly mentions in two places, Rom. xv. 4. “ Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.” 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16, 17. “ The Holy Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation, through faith, which is in Jesus Christ. All Scripture given by inspiration of God, is profitable for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work.” For though God doth principally and chiefly lead us by his Spirit, yet he sometimes conveys his comfort and consolation to us through his children, whom he raises up and inspires to speak or write a word in season.— And such, as are led by the Spirit, cannot neglect, but do naturally love, and are wonderfully cherished by, that which proceedeth from the same Spirit in another; because such mutual emanations of the heavenly life tend to quicken the mind, when at any time it is overtaken with heaviness. Peter himself declares this to have been the end of his writing, 2 Pet. i. 12, 13. “ Wherefore I will not be negligent to put you always in remembrance of these things; though ye know them, and be established in the present truth: yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up, by putting you in remembrance.”—“ This is the great work of the Scriptures and their service to us, that we may witness them fulfilled in us, and so discern the stamp of God’s Spirit and ways upon them, by the inward acquaintance we have with the same Spirit and work in our hearts.”*

As in the fourth section Barclay enforces the impropriety of considering the Scriptures as a more certain and principal rule of faith and manners, than the immediate teachings of the Holy Spirit; so, in this last, he removes any suspicion of his intending to render uncertain, or depreciate the value of, the sacred records in the state we now have them, by acknowledging that he is willing to rank them next to the Spirit from which they proceeded, and to concede to them every thing they say of themselves, and then adopts, Rom. xv. 4. 2 Tim. iii. 15, 16 17. and 2 Pet. i. 12, 13. as descriptive of their nature and design. Here is another proof that he did not himself entertain

those doubts, that he says, existed among divers of the ancient fathers respecting some books included in the present canon of Scripture; the 2d Epistle of Peter, which in this place he acknowledges, being one of these books. The sixth section pursues the same subject as the fifth, and is nearly as follows :

‘ § 6. *In this respect above mentioned then we have shewn what service and use the holy Scriptures, as managed in and by the Spirit, are of to the church of God ; wherefore we do account them a secondary rule. Moreover, because they are commonly acknowledged by all, to have been written by the dictates of the Holy Spirit, and that the errors, which may be supposed by the injury of time to have slipped in,* are not such, but that there is a sufficient, clear testimony left to all the essentials of the Christian faith ; [we do look upon them, as the only fit outward judge of controversies among Christians, and that whatsoever doctrine is contrary unto their testimony, may therefore justly be rejected as false. And for our parts, we are very willing that all our doctrines and practices be tried by them ; which we never refused, nor ever shall, in all controversies with our adversaries, as the judge and test. We shall also be very willing to admit it as a positive, certain maxim, that whatsoever any do, pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to the Scriptures, be accounted and reckoned a delusion of the devil].†* For as we never lay claim to the Spirit’s leadings, that we may cover ourselves in any thing that is evil ; so we know, that as

* A reader of Verax observes, that in p. 94. of the Vindication he renders, ‘ Si qui errores irrepserint, parvi sunt,’ &c. *The errors that have crept in are small, &c.* instead of *If any errors have crept in, they are small, &c.* Thus, without the aid of a mistranslation, the Latin original is not a whit more favourable to Verax than the English.

† What is inclosed between brackets is adopted by R. Claridge in his *Tractatus Hierogaphicus*, p. 2. and preceded by the following declaration—

‘ The holy Scriptures are the most excellent of all writings whatsoever, whether we consider the holy Author of them, the great God of heaven and earth ; or, the inspired penmen of them, the holy Prophets and Apostles, who spake and wrote as they were moved and guided by the Holy Ghost ; or, the divine truths therein declared and testified of, concerning the wonderful love of God for the reconciliation and salvation of lost mankind, through repentance towards God, and faith in, and obedience to, the Lord Jesus Christ, “ who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, “ and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works,” Tit. ii. 14. Upon which considerations thus summarily laid down, we esteem them worthy of preference to all other books in the world. For they are the words, sayings, and testimonies of God, Scriptures of Truth, divinely inspired writings, containing the judgments and statutes of the Lord, and the Magna Charta of his church.’

‘ every evil contradicts the Scriptures, so it doth also the Spirit
 ‘ in the first place, *from which the Scriptures came; and whose*
 ‘ *motions can never contradict one another, though they may appear*
 ‘ *sometimes to be contradictory to the blind eye of the natural man, as*
 ‘ *Paul and James seem to contradict one another.*’*

The italics distinguish what is omitted in the citation of this section in the Appeal. Vindex has adverted to the omission of the latter part of this paragraph; Verax in his *Vindication*, attempts to justify the omission, saying, Vindex ‘ points out a few
 ‘ words that follow it [the extract] in Barclay, which I did not
 ‘ repeat, because I had given their full import in the preceding
 ‘ part of the quotation.’† I deny that the *full import* of the closing paragraph is given in the former part of the section; the former adverts more immediately to the general belief of others in the inspiration of the Scriptures, the latter to his own belief, which is directly and unequivocally expressed; he also therein acknowledges the divine authority of the Epistle of James, one of the books to which Verax makes him apply the term *false*. Perhaps it is because Verax thought Barclay unauthorized to determine for a future generation, that he has omitted the middle of the paragraph he has cited, where speaking of trying doctrines by the Scriptures, it says, ‘ *which we never refused, nor ever shall,*
 ‘ *in all controversies with our adversaries, as the judge and test.*’ This may not accord with his creed, but that is not a sufficient apology for expunging it. Does he not at times forget that it is not his opinions, but those of our first friends, which are the present object of research? Verax by dropping the word *because* at the beginning of his quotation, and putting a period instead of a semicolon after *Christian faith*, has also varied the sense of Barclay.

Having examined the omissions of Verax, our next object is to consider with him, *In what sense Barclay is here to be understood*. After detailing and magnifying the errors alluded to by Barclay, as if they obscured those important doctrines of Christianity that affect outward religious communion; Verax gives this answer to the question: ‘ When Barclay therefore speaks
 ‘ of the Scriptures as the only outward judge of controversy,
 ‘ he can only mean in their original purity; several modes of
 ‘ enquiring into, and ascertaining which, he has particularly
 ‘ pointed out, and employed them freely for this very purpose.’‡ This is plausible, but not deducible from Barclay’s words, which are so far from implying that the errors supposed to have crept into the text by the injury of time, have so corrupted or perverted the Scriptures as to prevent their being the judge and test of Christian doctrines; that he asserts these supposed errors

* Barclay’s Apology, p. 85, 86.

† Vindication, p. 97.

‡ Appeal, p. 31.

not to be of sufficient importance to obstruct an appeal to them in their present state. If Barclay did not intend an appeal to the Scripture as an outward judge and test, until *every word and letter* were restored to their first purity, he must have appealed to a non-entity, as it is not probable, that will ever be the case.* I do not remember one single mode 'pointed out and employed' by Barclay to restore the copies of the original to their first purity.—To obviate these difficulties, as a late writer observes, 'Barclay's Apology was not adapted, as such an object did not come within the scope of his views in that work.'—'It was no part of his plan to recommend or adduce any evidence besides that of the testimony and inward persuasion of the Holy Spirit, in favour of the truth of the Scriptures; or to show the harmony and accordance of such parts as might be deemed inconsistent with each other; or to attempt the defence of particular passages which might be thought objectionable.' The reason of this is obvious; those, against whom Barclay's arguments were directed, were so far from attacking the divine authority of the Scriptures that they exalted them, in their opposition to the Quakers, above the Spirit of Christ. It was only to evince the superiority of the Holy Spirit, that Barclay at all referred to the difficulties that do occur respecting the strict and rigid accuracy of the text of

* That the errors alluded to are, not such as to alarm the serious reader, I trust will satisfactorily appear by the following observations of Robert Gray upon their nature and extent, in his *Key to the Old Testament*. After adverting to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the final dispersion of the Jews, he proceeds:—'Henceforth, no copy of the Hebrew Scriptures was preserved from injury by the vigilance of public guardians, except those which were kept in the scattered synagogues of foreign and dispersed Jews; and it is from this time, probably, that errors and corruptions crept into the sacred text. As there was no longer any established standard of correctness, by which the fidelity of the different copies could be tried, faults and mistakes were insensibly introduced; the carelessness of transcribers occasioned accidental omissions: marginal annotations were adopted into the text; and the resemblances between different Hebrew letters, of which, many are remarkably similar in form, contributed, with other circumstances, too numerous to be here specified, to produce alterations and imperfections in the different copies, which, from the difficulty of collating manuscripts for correction, were necessarily perpetuated. Hence originated those various readings, and occasional differences, which we find in the several manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible.—Fortunately, however, it has happened, that these differences are seldom important in their nature or consequences, as appears from a collation of those various copies which pious and munificent men have industriously collected; and it should seem indeed an especial effect of some pecu-

the sacred writings. Being acquainted with the original languages, he may occasionally have corrected our English version by the Hebrew and Greek text, where he thought the translators had obscured the sense of the original. That these variations were not, in Barclay's views, so numerous and important, as to render our English version unfit to be the outward judge and test of the truth of Christian doctrines, his *Catechism and Confession of Faith* is an indubitable proof. In this work he purposely abstains from any correction of our common translation, to prove to our opposers that he was not obliged to take any advantage that way, it being sufficiently correct in its present state to exhibit the Quakers' views of the Christian religion; and if it be not in its present state congenial with Verax's notions of that religion, it must be because they differ from Barclay's; neither is it probable that a correction of the immaterial errors that have crept in, would render it more pliable to his purpose.

We have reason to conclude that Verax thought Barclay had used 'strong expressions,' for him to be impelled in order 'to avoid their force,' to have recourse to the supposition that Barclay did not speak of the Scriptures in the state they have reached us, when he denominated them 'the only or 'most fit outward judge of controversy among Christians.'—Collect the most ancient manuscripts existing, and let them be

'liar Providence, that those passages which relate to faith and doctrine, 'those which describe the attributes and perfections of God, and treat 'concerning our obligations and duty, are in general preserved *uniform* 'and *uncorrupted*: secure in their *integrity*, from the *consistent testi-* 'monies of every copy, we may confidently rely on the instructions 'which they reveal, and stedfastly adhere to the principles which they 'inculcate.'—After observing that 'wherever the gospel was received, 'the law and the prophets were called into notice and esteem;' he continues, 'Copies then must have multiplied by increasing veneration, 'and however trivial inaccuracies might proportionably prevail, con- 'trived alteration must have become more impracticable. Thus every 'circumstance seems to have conspired to preserve the integrity of the 'Scriptures free from a suspicion of intended corruption, or of change 'in any essential point. The jealous care with which they were pre- 'served in the tabernacle, and in the temple, being not more calcu- 'lated to secure their integrity, than that reverence which afterwards 'displayed itself in the dispersed synagogues, and in the churches con- 'secrated to the Christian faith; and hence we find in the Scriptures 'only such corruptions as might have been accidentally produced— 'the mistakes are chiefly in proper names and numbers; in the latter 'often occasioned by the use of letters for numbers. Irenæus, Beza, ' &c.' p. 13, 14, 15, 16, 17. and note [r]

It is as improbable that every error of the kind here described, which occurs either in the Old or New Testament, will ever be completely removed, as it is unimportant that it should be so.

carefully collated, and the vulgar translations revised; nevertheless some unimportant errors would most likely prevent the text of the sacred records from being in *that purity* in which only Verax says Barclay acknowledges them to be an outward, secondary rule of faith and manners. It would no doubt rejoice the sincere admirers of the sacred writings, that every inaccuracy contained in them that has the most distant relation to faith or manners were removed, however unessential in itself; in order that *such as seek for blemishes, and are disposed to cavil at minute imperfections* might be deprived of one of the twigs at which they continually catch. Entirely to silence the captious who search for defects, is not to be expected, for when real difficulties are done away, they will raise imaginary ones, as Verax has done in the second part of the Appeal, respecting both the Old and New Testament.

I have endeavoured to follow the chain of Barclay's argument in the copious extracts adduced; which furnish sufficient evidence, that the errors of transcribers and translators, he adverts to, were entirely of a similar nature with those noticed by Warburton and Gray;---that he considered the text of our English version as therefore uncorrupt in all essential, or even material points. This he has placed beyond the shadow of a doubt, by having proved the truth of 'the whole principles of the people called 'Quakers,' from our common translation of the Scriptures, without correcting it by the Hebrew and Greek copies, which had he done, he observes that he could have produced other very clear Scriptures as additional evidence in support of their principles: the heads of which I shall briefly enumerate, as hence it will be seen that Barclay has included in his consideration every doctrine of the Christian faith.

1st. Concerning God, and the true and saving knowledge of him.

2d. Concerning the Divinity of Christ, and his appearance in the flesh.

3d. Concerning the Scriptures.

4th. Concerning the New Birth, and the inward revelation of Christ.

5th. Concerning the universal and saving light of Christ.

6th. Concerning Faith, Justification, and good Works.

7th. Concerning Perfection or freedom from sin.

8th. Concerning Perseverance, or falling from Grace.

9th. Concerning the Church and Ministry.

10th. Concerning Worship.

11th. Concerning Baptism, and what is called the Lord's Supper.

12th. Concerning the Life of a Christian in general.

13th. Concerning Magistracy.

14th. Concerning the Resurrection.

15th. Concerning the condition of man in the Fall.*

Verax expresses a fear of the influence of the corrupted passages in our English version: what occasion for this alarm, if the doctrines just enumerated can be clearly illustrated and proved by this version of the Scriptures? But from the general tenor of Verax's productions, from the dissonance there is between them and Barclay's elucidations of the principles of the Friends, it is too evident that his fear is respecting passages of Scripture, adopted by Barclay as '*original, apostolical, and divine,*' and Barclay's construction of these passages will probably include him among those whom Verax describes as '*torturing and twisting passages of dubious import, or difficult interpretation, in support of humanly devised systems, which embrace and inculcate unintelligible dogmas, and mysterious tenets, that have no more accordance with the genuine doctrines of the gospel, than darkness has with the light of day.*'† We are not informed what these '*unintelligible dogmas and mysterious tenets*' are; if he mean to pronounce all doctrines '*unintelligible dogmas,*' except those '*respecting which there has never been much, if any controversy among Christians,*' I believe, of the preceding fourteen articles, twelve, at least, must be struck off the list, and perhaps what would then remain might be a band of union wide enough to embrace the Deist.

If Verax's fear respecting the influence of the corruptions and interpolations of the Scripture, is confined to the trivial errors of Warburton, Gray, and Barclay; why such pains in the 2d part of the Appeal to disprove the authenticity of the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, which give an account of the miraculous conception of Christ; ascribing them to the pagan converts of the second century, because they '*make against his own opinions?*' Barclay not only adopts these accounts of the birth of Christ as authentic scripture in his Catechism; but in his letter to Adrian Paets, controverting the position that '*men are not obliged to believe God producing any revelation in the soul concerning matter of fact, unless there be added some miracle obvious to the outward senses,*' to prove it to be a revelation from God; mentions the case of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary, as in point, which he thus introduces.

'We need no outward miracles to move us to believe the Scriptures; and therefore much less were they necessary to the

* The doctrine of the Fall forms no distinct head in Barclay's Catechism, but is amply treated of in his Apology; and the Scriptures quoted by him to prove it, are according to king James's translation.

† Vindication, p. 109.

‘ prophets, who writ them. For we see in many places of
 ‘ the prophets, where they declare prophecies as revealed to
 ‘ them of God, there is not a word mentioned of any out-
 ‘ ward miracle, as that by which alone they were certain of
 ‘ it. Moreover the falseness of this argument doth appear, in
 ‘ that the Scripture doth declare many contingent truths to
 ‘ have been revealed to the prophets in dreams.—Of which we
 ‘ have a clear example in Joseph, the husband of the blessed
 ‘ Virgin, who, when he observed his wife with child, was told
 ‘ in a dream, that she had conceived by the Holy Ghost : now
 ‘ I would know to which of Joseph’s outward senses was this
 ‘ revealed ? or what miracle had he to induce him to believe ?
 ‘ which could neither be proved (so as to make an infallible
 ‘ application to Mary), by the testimony of the Scripture, and
 ‘ which, being against the order of nature, did choke his reason.
 ‘ The Scripture mentions no miracle in this matter, and yet no
 ‘ doubt Joseph had highly sinned, had he not believed this reve-
 ‘ lation, and notwithstanding rejected his wife as an adulteress.*

The latter part of this passage is cited in the 2d part of the Appeal, to prove that Barclay thought a belief in Mary’s miraculous conception not to be ‘ a proper, necessary, and essential
 ‘ article of Christian faith, to be proposed as a condition of
 ‘ religious fellowship.’ It is certainly a curious paragraph to prove such a position, since Barclay therein asserts that Joseph would have *highly sinned* if he had not believed in the miraculous conception, until confirmed to him by some miracle obvious to his outward senses ; also, that we need no outward miracles to move us to believe the Scriptures, of which the passage in question forms a part : whether or not Barclay thought this belief essential to outward Christian communion and fellowship, let the following words of his, which have been before cited in this work, on another occasion, decide.

‘ For as we believe all those things to have been certainly
 ‘ transacted, which are recorded in the holy Scriptures, con-
 ‘ cerning the *birth*, life, *miracles*, sufferings, *resurrection*, and
 ‘ ascension of Christ ; so we do also believe that it is the duty
 ‘ of every one to believe it, to whom it pleases God to reveal
 ‘ the same, and to bring to them the knowledge of it ; yea we
 ‘ believe it were damnable unbelief not to believe it, when so
 ‘ declared ; but to resist that holy seed, which as minded would
 ‘ lead and incline every one to believe it as it is offered unto
 ‘ them.†

Verax must be acquainted with this passage ; it is in Barclay’s Apology, which has always been, and remains to be

* Barclay’s Works, p. 903, 904.

† Barclay’s Apology, p. 141.

considered as the standard of the Quakers' doctrines. Is it consistent with the dictates of common sense to expect a society to continue united, in religious fellowship, with one who persists in propagating what it has publicly denominated damnable unbelief? Are not the rights of religious societies as sacred and inviolable as those of individuals? Is a society of Christians to be continually pursued by the shafts of malevolence, branded as antichristian, and as actuated by prejudice and passion, because it will not apostatize from what it believes to be the primitive faith of the gospel?

'In fact, while men,' to borrow the words of a recent writer, 'continue to differ in religious opinion as they now do, the most likely way for general peace is for them to class themselves according to their faith; for no class to exercise dominion over the rest; for their controversies to be managed with temper and moderation; and for no person to assume a right of teaching and remaining in a Society, the ancient tenets of which he rejects, or which is not disposed to adopt the new ones which he may propose.'

Although R. Barclay maintains that the immediate revelation of the Holy Spirit upon the mind of man must be his principal rule and guide, as without this the Scriptures will be only as a dead letter to him, unprofitable and useless; he uniformly disclaims that any revelation from God can contradict the outward testimony of the Scriptures; because the Spirit of God, 'by which they were dictated and committed to writing,' cannot contradict itself.

In his second Proposition 'Of immediate Revelation,' he says, 'Moreover these divine, inward revelations, which we make absolutely necessary for the building up of true faith, neither do, nor can ever contradict the outward testimony of the Scriptures, or right and sound reason.*' Verax has discovered a partiality for the close of this paragraph, but he is mistaken if he thinks, that by right reason, Barclay means 'the fallen, corrupt, and defiled reason of man,' which understands not the things of the Spirit of God.

Again, in his Vindication of his Apology, 'But he,' Brown 'thinks I drive at something more intolerable, to wit; *That the revelations the Quakers pretend to, or the light within, is to be preferred, as the more primary and principal rule, to the Scriptures.*

'If the Quakers did affirm, any revelations they speak of, as coming from that light, either were or could be contrary to the Scriptures, he would say something; otherwise it will amount to no more, but that commands, as they are imprinted upon the soul, that is, the law written in the heart by the

* Barclay's Apology, p. 18.

‘ Spirit, is more primarily and principally the rule, than the same things written and received only from another.’*

I believe every objection of Verax against Barclay’s full belief in the inspiration and divine authority of the Scriptures has been removed, but as it is desirable to obviate every difficulty that may be presented ; another writer of that party having also mentioned ‘ that Barclay objects to the necessity of believing ‘ that the Scriptures are a filled canon,’ I shall add one more citation, from the 9th Sect. of his third Proposition.

‘ § 9. The last, and that which at first view seems to be ‘ the greatest objection, is this.

‘ *If the Scripture be not the adequate, principal, and only rule, then ‘ it would follow, that the Scripture is not complete, nor the canon filled; ‘ that if men be now immediately led and ruled by the Spirit, they ‘ may add new Scriptures of equal authority with the old; whereas ‘ every one that adds, is cursed: yea, what assurance have we, but ‘ at this rate, every one may bring in a new gospel according to his ‘ fancy?’*

‘ The dangerous consequences insinuated in this objection ‘ were fully answered in the latter part of the last Proposition, ‘ in what was said a little before; offering freely to disclaim ‘ all pretended revelations contrary to the Scriptures.—But secondly, we have shut the door upon all such doctrine in this ‘ very position, affirming, that the Scriptures give a full and ‘ ample testimony to all the principal doctrines of the Christian ‘ faith. For we do firmly believe, that there is no other gospel ‘ or doctrine to be preached, but that which was delivered by ‘ the apostles; and do freely subscribe to that saying, Let him ‘ that preacheth any other gospel than that which has been ‘ already preached by the apostles, and according to the Scriptures, be accursed. So we distinguish betwixt a revelation of ‘ a new gospel and new doctrines, and a new revelation of the ‘ good old gospel and doctrines; the last we plead for; but the ‘ first we utterly deny.’—

‘ As to the Scriptures being a filled canon, I see no necessity ‘ of believing it,—for it cannot be found in any book of the ‘ Scriptures that these books, and just these, and no other, are ‘ canonical, as all are forced to acknowledge.—If it should ‘ please God to bring to us any of those books, which by the ‘ injury of time are lost, which are mentioned in the Scripture, ‘ as, The prophecy of Enoch, the book of Nathan, &c. or, the ‘ third epistle of Paul to the Corinthians; I see no reason why ‘ we ought not to receive them, and place them with the rest.’†

It is unnecessary to point out the harmless nature of Barclay’s

* Barclay’s Works, p. 753.

† Barclay’s Apology, p. 90, 91, 92.

objection to the necessity of believing the Scriptures to be a filled canon; the loss of the books he mentions, not at all affecting the divine authority of those books, which are providentially preserved to us.

‘But the great misfortune has been,’ says Verax, ‘that *many things* in these writings, *even admitting them to have been genuine*, are improperly advanced into principal and fundamental points of faith and Christian communion, that are laid no such stress on by the writers themselves; and meanings attached to them, which the idle acquiescence of ages has served to incrust, that are not only far from being sanctioned by the passages from whence they are hewn for that purpose, but, also, in strict opposition and contradiction to many other passages that define the necessary and essential articles of Christian faith, in a manner totally incompatible with the admission of scarcely any part of the superstructures of these creed and system making advocates.’*

From this extract it appears that there are many things in the Scriptures which Verax thinks are not genuine (I suppose he means authentic), from which principal and fundamental points of faith are hewn, that are not sanctioned by the passages themselves, even admitting them to be genuine, and which are also in strict opposition to the necessary and essential articles of Christian faith. That these strictures are pointed at our Society, is evident from page 109 of the *Vindication*. Does Verax then believe that there are *essential ARTICLES of Christian FAITH*? if he were not so great an enemy to *articles of faith*, perhaps he might feel some qualms of conscience for continuing in apparent religious fellowship with a society, whose principles he considers in strict opposition and contradiction to the Christian religion.

If an inflexible adherence to the faith of our forefathers, from a conviction of its being the true faith, is to be deemed ‘an idle acquiescence;’ as one of the Society, I shall not be ashamed to suffer this reproach for maintaining the faith once delivered to the saints. R. Barclay speaks of some in his time whose ‘chief principles’ were quite contrary to the Scriptures; that Verax may judge how far they assimilate with those he has been describing, I will repeat Barclay’s words; they are in his *Catechism*.

‘Among Protestants I know the Socinians are great pretenders to the Scriptures, and in words as much exalt them, as any other people; and yet it is strange to see, how that not only in many things they are not agreeable to them; but in some of their chief principles quite contrary unto them, as in their denying the Divinity of Christ, which is as expressly

‘ mentioned as any thing can be ; *And the Word was God*, John i. ‘ As also in denying his being from the beginning, against the ‘ very tenor of that of John i. and divers others, as at large is ‘ shown in the third chapter of this treatise. Divers other things ‘ as to them might be mentioned ; but this may suffice, to stop ‘ their boasting in this matter.’*

Barclay must, in this place, mean the Divinity of Christ in the *strict* and *proper* sense of the phrase ; the ancient as well as the modern Socinians, admitting it in the *ambiguous* and *improper* sense in which it has been adopted by Verax. For what is said on this important point in the third chapter of Barclay’s Catechism, I refer the reader to my letter to John Evans, pages 2 and 3.

I agree with Verax that ‘ the most usual source of difference ‘ of sentiment’ arises rather from the different sense in which many passages of Scripture are received, than from any doubt respecting ‘ the mere accuracy of the text, or the fidelity of the ‘ translation,’ the justness of this observation is verified in the various societies into which Christendom is divided (exclusive of the Socinians), notwithstanding their full belief in the Divine authority of the sacred records. That this may also be one source of difference between Hannah Barnard and the Society of Friends, will be admitted, but as her principal dissent from them consists in such a refusal to acknowledge her unequivocal belief in the authenticity of many parts of the Scriptures, as appears to them to involve in uncertainty the divine authority of the whole, what advantage can result from deciding ‘ whether ‘ many passages ought to be received in a literal or a figurative ‘ sense,’ if we have afterwards to determine whether these passages are Scripture or not ? Besides, as H. Barnard rested her defence upon her sentiments being congenial with those of our Society, and upon the substance of its faith according with hers, disclaiming any intention to introduce new dogmas repugnant to its primitive faith ; she thus reduces the controversy to the two following points. 1st. What was the faith of our first Friends ? 2d. Do Hannah Barnard’s opinions accord with it ? These two points must be first determined, so as either to remove, or confirm the severe reflections on the conduct of the Society so liberally dispensed by Verax and his associates ; before the reader’s attention is diverted by *irrelevant* matter : and I trust this will sufficiently apologize for Vindex and myself, if we have not always followed Verax when he has diverged from these two points, and enlarged the field of discussion.

* Barclay’s Works, p. 174.

CHAP. VI.

A continuation of the same subject.—The belief of WILLIAM PENN and RICHARD MORRIS in the authenticity and inspiration of the Scriptures, illustrated by divers extracts from their writings.

THE first work of William Penn, from which Verax has favoured us with extracts, is, *A Discourse of the general Rule of Faith and Practice*. Copious as his citations from this work are, in the *Appeal*, they keep the reader in the dark as to the design of the discourse itself; the tenor of the argument being kept entirely out of sight. Vindex's *Examination* of the *Appeal* has, however, produced another extract from this discourse in the *Vindication*, by Verax, which, though comparatively short, elucidates the purport of it, more than the three pages which are devoted to it in the *Appeal*: I shall therefore repeat it.

‘A Rule and the Rule,’ says William Penn, ‘are two things. By *the rule of faith and practice*, I understand, the living, spiritual, immediate, omnipresent, discovering, ordering Spirit of God: And by *a rule*, I apprehend some instrument, by and through which this great and universal rule may convey its directions. Such a subordinate, secondary, and declaratory rule, we never said several parts of Scripture were not; yet we confess the reason of our obedience is not merely because they are there written (for that were legal), but because they are the eternal precepts of the Spirit, in men’s consciences, there repeated and declared; it is the testimony of the Spirit, which is the true rule for believing and understanding of the Scripture; therefore not the Scripture, but the Spirit of truth, must be the rule for our believing and understanding them.

‘ Thus held the ancients.’* Penn then proceeds to confirm this by the testimonies of *Tertullian*, *Justin Martyr*, *Jerom*, *Epiphanius*, among the ancients; and *Erasmus*, *Luther*, *Calvin*, *Beza*, and several others among the Protestants.

By this ‘ sketch of the work,’ we may see as with a glance of the eye, the same distinction between *the Rule* and *a Rule* of faith and practice, that is observed by R. Barclay: this is further confirmed by the following passages in Penn’s discourse.

‘ Now the Scripture tells us, that “ no man knows the Father “ but the Son, and he to whom the Son reveals him:” and as none ‘ knows the things of man save the spirit of man, so the things ‘ of God knows no man, but the Spirit of God. Hence we ‘ may safely conclude, that the creating Word that was with ‘ God, and was God, in whom was life, and that life the light ‘ of men, and who is the quickening Spirit, was *He*, by whom ‘ God in all ages hath revealed himself; consequently, that light ‘ or Spirit must have been the *general* rule of men’s knowledge, ‘ faith, and obedience, with respect to God.—To which the ‘ apostle and prophet thus agree: 1st. In that “ whatever makes ‘ manifest is light,” Eph. v. 13. 2dly. That “ whatever might ‘ be known of God was made manifest within,” Rom. i. 19. ‘ for God (who is Light, 1 John i. 5,) had shown it unto them: ‘ and “ God hath shewn unto thee, O man, what is good, and ‘ what God requireth of thee,” &c. Mic. vi. 8. which could ‘ not be without the light of his Son shining in man’s con- ‘ science; therefore the light of Christ in the conscience must ‘ needs have been the *general Rule*, &c. It was by this law ‘ that Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Melchisedeck, &c. walked, and ‘ were accepted, as faith Irenæus and Tertullian; they were ‘ just by the law written in their hearts; then was it their ‘ Rule to, and in, that just state. Iren. b. 2. c. 30. Tertul. con. ‘ jud. p. 184.’

‘ Obj. *It seems then you deny the Scripture’s to be the general ‘ Rule, &c.*’

‘ *Ans.* How can they be the general Rule, that have not ‘ been general? That which was both before, and since they ‘ were in being, must needs be more general than they; but ‘ that was this light in the conscience, the law and guide of ‘ those patriarchs (for the Scriptures began long after, in the ‘ time of Moses), consequently that must be the general ‘ Rule, &c.’—

‘ Obj. *But is not the Scripture the Rule, &c. of our day?*’

‘ *Ans.* If *the Rule*, then the *general Rule*; for whatsoever is ‘ *The Rule* of Faith and Life, excludeth all other from being ‘ *general*, they being but particular in respect of itself; there- ‘ fore not *the Rule*, though *a Rule* of Faith and Life. But be-

‘sides their not being *general*, I have several reasons to offer, why they cannot be *The Rule* of faith and life, &c. 1st. If now the rule, then ever the rule; but they were not ever the rule.—If the faith of God’s people in all ages be of one nature, then the rule, but of one nature. But clear it is, Heb. xi. The faith has been but of one nature. In short, if the holy ancients had faith before they had, or wrote Scripture, they had a rule before they had or wrote Scripture; for where faith is, there is a rule for that faith.—2d. If the Scriptures were the *general rule*, they must have always been a perfect rule, ever since they were a rule. But this is impossible, since they were many hundred years in writing, and are now imperfect also as to *number*. How then are they the perfect rule? That they were not the perfect rule before they were written, must be granted,—and that they are imperfect now, as to *number*, I prove. Enoch’s prophecy is mentioned by Jude, but not extant in the Bible. The book of the wars of the Lord, Num. xxi. 14. The book of Jasher, Josh. x. 13. 2 Sam. i. 18. The book of Nathan, 2 Chron. ix. 29. The book of Shemaiah, 2 Chron. xii. 15. The book of Jehu. The epistle of the apostle Paul to the Laodiceans, Coloss. iv. 16. and several others mentioned in the Scriptures, not now extant:” he also says, ‘the Scriptures have not been, neither are the *general rule*, no not so much as of any age, since in no age can it be proved, that the whole or greatest part of the world had them.’*

We leave it to the reader to determine whether Vindex had not some reason for saying that W. Penn denied ‘the Scriptures to be the general rule, because they were not from the beginning, and are not yet general; and that his (W. P.’s) reasoning tends to this point, in opposition to the objections which he supposes may be brought by such as make them the only rule.’†

I had written thus far before I thought of recurring to the work entitled, *A Confutation of the charge of Deism: wherein the Christian and orthodox sentiments of William Penn are fully demonstrated by extracts from his own writings, which are cleared from the perversions and misconstructions of a nameless author, &c.* By Joseph Bessé; in whom I find an able ally, and whose services I intend to accept; as to his character, we are furnished with it by Verax himself, who describes him to be ‘a friend of un-questioned orthodoxy, and high estimation in our Society.’ I shall quote Joseph Bessé’s introductory remarks upon Penn’s Discourse, that the reader may see the coincidence between

* Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 592, 593, 594.

† Examination, p. 33.

them and those I had already penned before I took up Bessé's book.

' That our reader may have a right understanding of W. P.'s ' real sense in the present case, which this author takes care to ' conceal, it is necessary that he observe a distinction which W. ' P. strictly keeps through this whole Discourse, between *A* ' Rule of faith and practice, and *The* Rule, or, the general Rule ' of faith and practice; which distinction he thus expresses, ' page 599,' for which see my extract from Penn, page 135. ' So that he admits the Scriptures to be a Rule of faith and ' practice, as his constant appeal to them, through the whole ' course of his writings, doth demonstrate beyond all reasonable ' exceptions.*

In answer to the objection that W. P. says the Scriptures are not perfect, J. Bessé replies, ' And is not this true in the ' sense W. P. speaks it, and undertakes to prove, viz. *That they* ' *are imperfect as to number*: does he not shew that many Scrip- ' tures mentioned in those we have, are not now extant?† This is what R. Barclay advances against considering the present books of Scripture a complete, filled canon, but which, as I have before said, does not weaken the divine authority of the books *we have*.

The first extract from W. Penn's Discourse, that is brought forward in the Appeal, states, ' That ' the Scriptures, however ' useful to edification and comfort, seem not in their own ' nature and frame, to have been compiled and delivered as the ' general rule, and entire body of faith, but rather written upon ' particular occasions and emergencies,'—that the doctrines are scattered throughout the Scriptures, that in some places they are to be understood literally, in some metaphorically, in others mystically, from all which he makes the following deduction: ' *Now from all this, with abundance more that* ' *might be said, plain it is that the Scriptures are not plain, but to* ' *the spiritual man: thus Peter said of Paul's writings, that in* ' *many things they were hard to be understood*: therefore not such ' a rule which ought to be plain, proper, and intelligible,' &c.‡ The words in italics are omitted in the Appeal, but from them it appears that Penn believed the Scriptures to be plain to the spiritually minded: now all are exhorted to be such, therefore the Scriptures may become plain to all. Neither Penn's arguments, nor the deductions he makes from them, militate the least against the inspiration and divine authority of the Scriptures; no more is expressed by him than is contained in Claridge's eighth proposition cited in page 102. It is easy to give, with apparent

* Bessé's Confutation, p. 68, 69.

† Ibid. 71.

‡ Penn's Works, Vol. I. p. 594.

candour, long citations from argumentative discourses, and yet, by suppressing the premises and deductions, to mislead the reader, as to the true intent of the writer.

In the next quotation in the Appeal Penn says, ‘The question arises not about the truth of the text, for that is agreed on all hands.* I am greatly mistaken if the truth of the text be not an important question with our opponents in the present controversy. This quotation is a long one, the same passage is also adverted to by J. Bessé’s antagonist, who wished to prove that its purport was to detract from the value and divine authority of Scripture: his design being not very dissimilar from that of Verax, the same answer will suffice for both. I shall give first those parts of the extracts in question, that are particularly quoted and vindicated by Joseph Bessé, and secondly, the remarks of the latter on them.

“How shall I be assured,” says Penn, “that these Scriptures came from God? I am bound to try all things: if all things, then them amongst the rest. I would fain know what I must try them with? with the Scriptures? then the Scriptures must be the rule of my examination and faith concerning themselves, which is improper: if with the Spirit that gave them forth, which searcheth the deep things of God, (a measure of which is given to me to profit withal), then is it most congruous to call the Spirit, by way of excellency, and not the Scriptures, *the rule*.”†

‘Does W. P.’ adds J. Bessé, ‘here cast the least degree of contempt upon the Scriptures? Does he not acknowledge that the Spirit which searcheth the deep things of God, gave them forth? Is not that the very foundation of his argument? And is not the consequence he deduces so evident, that this *defender*‡ himself does not attempt to confute it? nor indeed does he say a syllable in disproof of the arguments in the next paragraph, where he tells us, that W. P. argues in the same manner as the Deists usually do. He is also pleased to tell us, that *he*, W. P. *falsely asserts* (with Mr. Hobbes, &c.) that they [the Scriptures] *were not authentic, till they were declared so in the council of Laodicea*. This is a grand mistake, for W. P. asserts no such thing: he indeed asserts, that we read they were first declared authentic by a public canon in the council of Laodicea; but he is very far from asserting that they were not authentic before; for he always held and acknowledged the Holy Scriptures to be given forth by divine inspiration, and consequently that they were authentic, and of divine authority,

* Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 595. † Ibid. Vol. I. 595.

‡ Of the Bishop of Litchfield and Coventry, in whose vindication the work, answered by J. Bessé, was written.

‘from the time they were at first written; nor did he pay such deference to councils, or their canons, as to suppose the authority of Holy Writ to have any dependence on their determination, &c.’*

This paragraph, which may not accord with Verax’s ideas, is an answer to the following objection, ‘*W. P. argues from the loss of the original Scriptures, and the various readings of copies, and the difference of translations, that the Scriptures are not the rule, in the very same manner as the Deists usually do; and he falsely asserts (with Mr. Hobbes, &c.) that they were not authentic, til they were declared so in the council of Laodicea.*’ My next extract from Bessé’s Confutation, I shall introduce with his opponent’s objection, viz. ‘*W. P. says, The Scriptures were not rightly discerned and collected by tradition; and again, The canon is uncertain, as is likewise the difference of canonical and apocryphal Scripture, &c.*’

To this Joseph Bessé answers, ‘I do not find these to be W. P.’s express words: however he does say thus:’

“Sure it is, that some of the Scriptures taken in by one council for canonical, were rejected by another as apocryphal, and that which was left out by the former for apocryphal, was taken in by the latter for canonical. Now, visible it is that they contradicted each other, and as true that they both erred, respecting the present belief: for your canon and catalogue vary from theirs, and, let me say without offence, from any catalogue you can produce. Behold the labyrinth of uncertainties you run yourselves into, who go from that heavenly gift in yourselves, by which the Holy Scriptures are truly discerned, relished, and distinguished from the inventions and abuses of men!”†

‘In all this’ adds J. Bessé, ‘W. P. has not a syllable against the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures, but against the authority of their determinations, who so contended with, and contradicted each other, about them,’ &c.‡

I shall not detain the reader with remarks upon the other citations in the Appeal from Penn’s *Discourse of the General Rule of Faith and Practice*: but observe in the words of his advocate, Joseph Bessé:—‘It is evident, that W. Penn’s reasoning in all this is most agreeable to Scripture testimony: he seems to me to do much more honour to the Scriptures, by urging the testimony of the Holy Spirit in confirmation of their authority, than is possible to be done by considering them as exclusive of the *indwelling Spirit of life* from whence they proceeded.’§

Before I advert to Verax’s citations from Penn’s *Address to*

* Bessé’s Confutation, p. 73, 74. † Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 596.

‡ Bessé’s Confutation, p. 74, 75. § Ibid. p. 85.

Protestants, I shall quote a passage or two from that work which more immediately relate to the Scriptures. After observing that we must be directed and guided by the same rule of faith as the church to which we belong, Penn says—‘ For it cannot be denied but that the great foundation of our Protestant religion is the divine authority of the Scriptures from without us, and the testimony—of the Holy Spirit within us. Upon this foot the first reformers stood, and made and maintained their separation from Rome, and freely offered up their innocent lives in confirmation. With good cause therefore it is the general consent of all sound Protestant writers, that neither traditions, councils, nor canons of any visible church, much less the edicts of any civil sessions or jurisdiction, but the Scriptures only, interpreted by the Holy Spirit in us, give the final determination in matters of religion, and that only in the conscience of every Christian to himself. Which Protestation made by the first public reformers against the Imperial edicts of Charles the fifth, imposing church traditions without Scripture authority, gave first beginning to the name of Protestant, and with that name hath ever been received this doctrine, which prefers the divine authority of the Scripture and Spirit, to that of the church and her traditions.’* Whence he exposes the impropriety of forcing others to be implicitly of our faith without conviction, observing ‘ for all societies are to govern themselves according to their institution and first principles of union. Where there is violence upon this part, tyranny and not order is introduced. Now since persuasion and conviction began all true Christian Societies, they must uphold themselves upon the same free bottom, or they turn antichristian.’ He also, further on, confutes the notion of a power in the church, to define, resolve, and impose ‘ upon all people under temporal and eternal punishment, articles of faith and bonds of Christian communion,’† This he confirms by extracts from some Protestant writers: and answering the objections of those who would invest the church with the power of imposing its faith upon individuals, he says:

‘ I am not unacquainted with the great objection that is made by Roman Catholics and some Protestants, high-churchmen, perhaps, that love the treason, but hate the traitor, that like this part of popery, but hate the Pope, viz. *There are doubts in Scripture, even about the most important points of faith: somebody must guide the weak; there must be some one ultimate, external, and visible judge to appeal to, who must determine and conclude all persons, as to their doubts and apprehensions concerning the inter-*

* Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 779.

† Ibid. p. 789.

pretation of Scripture ; otherwise, so many men, so many minds ; the church would be filled with controversy and confusion.

‘ I answer that the Scriptures are made more doubtful than they are, by such as would fain preserve to themselves the umpirage and judgeship of their meaning. I deny it in point of fact, that man’s duty is not most plainly expressed in all that concerns eternal salvation. But it is very strange, that when God intends nothing more by the Scriptures, than to reach the capacities of men, as to things on which their eternal salvation depends, that no book, if such men say true, should be so obscure, or subject to so many various, nay, contradictory constructions. Name me one author, Heathen, Jew, or Christian, that ever wrote with that obscurity, and seeming inconsistency, which some gladly pretend to find in the Holy Scriptures, that they might have the use and keeping of them from the vulgar, and make their own ends by it.’

‘ Is then every body’s book to be understood but God’s ? was that written not to be understood ?—But to shut up this argument about the difficulty of understanding the Scripture and pretended necessity of a visible judge ; I say, Whatsoever may be spoken, may be written ; or thus, Whatsoever a visible judge can now say, the holy penmen, by God’s direction, might have written ; and what an omniscient and omnipotent God did know, and could do, for man’s salvation, an omnibenevolent God, that tells us, he delights not in the death of one soul, but rather that he should be saved, would certainly have done for man. And because God is as omnibenevolent, as omniscient and omnipotent, we must conclude he has done it ; and it is great presumption, and a mean shelter to ignorance or ambition, to raise a credit to human devices, by beating down the true value of the Scriptures.*

Apparently opposite motives sometimes produce effects not very dissimilar. Thus the high-church doctor, to support the authority and power of the church may discover obscurity and seeming inconsistency in the Scripture, that the laity may be dependent upon his interpretation to elucidate its meaning ; but here he stops, without endeavouring with sacrilegious hands to sap its divine authority ; but the Socinian who finds many parts of Scripture to be as a ‘ stone of stumbling and rock of offence,’ that cannot be removed out of his way by any comment, surmounts all his difficulties by stratagem : he first affects great veneration for the Scripture as a criterion of Christian faith ; but when pressed with Scripture authority, says, that he only appeals to the Scripture in its original purity, then details and magnifies the occasional errors of transcribers and translators

into gross and fraudulent corruptions and interpolations, and urges the doubtful authenticity of whole books of the present canon of Scripture. After having thus made the sacred text rather more pliable to his purpose, the mangled volume must appear before his inquisitorial tribunal, and be put again to the torture to make it express meanings 'that are not only 'far from being sanctioned by the passages from whence they 'have been forced for that purpose, but which also are in strict 'opposition and contradiction to many other passages that define 'necessary and essential articles of the Christian faith.'

The more our opinions diverge from the truth, the more they shrink from an examination by the Scriptures of truth: this is verified by the conduct of the Papist and Socinian, the first withholds the Scriptures from the common people to prevent detection; the last, not having this in his power, weakens the force of an appeal to them, by making their authority uncertain and precarious. The first approaches too near to idolatry; the last to infidelity: hence genuine Scripture doctrine is inauspicious to each.

If W. Penn was offended with '*obscurity and seeming inconsistency*,' being applied to the Scripture without any intention to depreciate its authority; what would he have said to the barbarous treatment it meets with from the modern Socinian? I refer Verax to the section entitled, *Scriptures Socinianized*, in Penn's *Spirit of Truth vindicated*, for an answer to this question.

In the *Vindication* we are informed in a tone of triumph that above six pages of the Appeal are occupied, with quotations from Penn's *Address to Protestants*. This is true; and if Verax had filled as many more pages with quotations equally pertinent from Penn's *Reflections and Maxims*, Vindex would probably have manifested the same 'thyness in declining to 'examine his quotations' from the latter, as much as from the former work, for this good reason, because 'in this,' to borrow the words of a late writer 'as in almost every other 'dispute, it usually happens that much time is lost in referring to a multitude of passages which prove nothing to 'the purpose, or in maintaining propositions, which are either not disputed, or, whether they be admitted or denied, are entirely indifferent as to the matter in debate; 'until at last the mind, perplexed and confounded with the 'endless subtleties of controversy, loses sight of the main question, and never arrives at truth.' That it may not, however, be supposed that I am 'the man, who, conscious of the weakness of his cause, is interested in concealing it.' I will examine into what appears, from the *Vindication*, to have been Verax's design in citing the long extracts just adverted to: if I understand him, it is to prove that our Society requires a more

extended confession of the Christian faith, than was necessary for admission into the primitive Christian church. I acknowledge without hesitation, that it certainly does. But what does Verax gain by this? Does not W. Penn, himself, in answer to the question cited from him, both in the *Appeal* and the *Vindication* give, (although he laments the necessity of it), a more extended confession of faith? And Verax, with all his parade of quotation, has, for reasons best known to himself, left us to seek for this answer in Penn's Works?

Verax says, 'It may be proper to enquire what the principal points are, which they' his extracts from Penn, 'tend to establish?' W. Penn is the most fit person to answer this question.

'True faith in God,' says *this great man*, 'is entirely believing and trusting in God, confiding in his goodness, resigning up to his will, obeying his commands, and relying upon his conduct and mercies, respecting this life and that which is to come.—This holy faith excludes no age of the world; the just men, the Cornelius's, in every generation, have had some degree of it: it was more especially the faith of the simpler ages of the world, such as those in which the patriarchs lived, who having not an outward law, became a law to themselves, and did the things contained in the law, for they believed in God, and through faith obtained a good report. *But because that it hath pleased God, in order to man's recovery from that grievous lapse, disobedience hath cast him into, at sundry times, and in divers manners, to appear to the sons of men, first by his prophets, and last of all by his Son, and that these manifestations have had something peculiar to them, and very remarkable in them, so that they claim a place in our creed, it will not be amiss that we briefly consider them. The first was that of the prophets, in which Moses preceded, by whom the law came to the Jews, but grace and truth to mankind by Jesus Christ.—The one did forerun the other, as in order of time, so in nature of dispensation: the law was the gospel begun, the gospel was the law fulfilled or finished; they cannot be parted. The Decalogue or ten commandments were little more than what had been known and practised before; for it seemed but an epitome and transcript of the law writ in man's heart by the finger of God:—this therefore must needs be a part of our creed: for it relates to that righteousness which is indispensable and immutable: the other part of their constitution that was peculiar to their political, typical, and mutable state,* the gospel, is either unconcerned in it, or else ended it by the bringing in of a better hope, and a more enduring substance; but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ.—This is the most excellent*

* The *Appeal* instead of this says, 'as to the ritual part.'

' dispensation ; it is ours, and it becomes us to weigh well our interest in it. Take it in other words of the Holy Ghost : " God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath, in these last days, spoken to us by his Son ;—God so loved the world, that—he gave his only-begotten Son into the world, that the world through him might be saved." ' And here two things present themselves to our consideration : first, the person, who he was ; what his authority : secondly, his message, his doctrine, what he taught ; which though never so reasonable in itself, depended very much, in its entertainment among the people, upon the truth of his mission and authority, that he was no impostor, but came from God, and was the promised Messiah. This was done two ways ; by revelation and by miracles. By revelation, to such as were as well prepared and inclined, as honest Peter, the woman of Samaria, &c.—By miracles, to those that being blinded by ignorance or prejudice, needed to have their senses struck with such supernatural evidences, from many of whom this witness came, that he was the Messiah, the Christ and Son of God.*

The Italic, as before, marks Verax's omissions, which, with others already noticed, are a practical comment on his expressions in his preface to the Appeal, where, after describing our first friends as ' enlightened advocates for the cause of truth,' he adds, ' but I also esteem them, as having been men liable to err, and whose works need examination and discrimination, &c.' Nobody can object to his discriminating *for himself*, ' between clear and useful passages, and such as may be obscure or unintelligible,' but does this license a wanton exercise of discrimination, when he is giving, *not his own* sentiments, but those of another writer by extracts from his works ? The introduction of the part omitted in the foregoing citation was necessary to a clear understanding of what follows it ; but is it not probable that an objection to acknowledge an unreserved, full belief in the Divine mission of Moses, and that his dispensation was part of the divine plan in order to recover man from his fallen state, prevented the insertion of the whole of the passage.

Penn pursuing the same argument, continues, ' I have nothing to do now with atheists, or those that call themselves Theists ; but such as own themselves Christians ; and shall therefore keep to my task, namely, What of the Christian dispensation, is so peculiar and important, as to challenge of right the name of Creed or Faith ? I say then, That the belief of Jesus of Nazareth to be the promised Messiah, the Son and Christ of God, come and sent from God to restore and save mankind, is the first, and was then the only requisite *article* of

‘ faith, without any large confessions, or an heap of principles
 ‘ or opinions resolved upon, after curious and tedious debates, by
 ‘ councils and fynods: and this may be proved both by example
 ‘ and doctrine.’*

Several examples are then produced by him, to prove what is here advanced; which are in part enumerated by Verax, but as neither he nor myself will object to them, I shall pass them over, and consider Penn’s answer to objections to the simplicity of this confession.

‘ But here I expect to be assaulted with this objection: if
 ‘ this be all that is necessary to be believed to salvation, of what
 ‘ use is the rest of Scripture? I answer of great use, as the
 ‘ apostle himself teaches us: “ All Scripture is given by inspi-
 ‘ ration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for
 ‘ correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of
 ‘ God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good
 ‘ works.”† ‘ It concerns the whole life and conversation of a
 ‘ man, but every passage in it is not therefore fit to be such an
 ‘ article of faith, as upon which Christian communion ought or
 ‘ ought not—be maintained. For though it be all equally true,
 ‘ it is not all equally important: the question is not whether all
 ‘ the truths contained in Scripture are not to be believed;
 ‘ but whether those truths are equally important? and whether
 ‘ the belief with the heart, and confession with the mouth, that
 ‘ Jesus is the Christ and Son of God, be not as sufficient now
 ‘ to entitle a man to communion here, and salvation hereafter,
 ‘ as in those times; against which nothing can be, of weight,
 ‘ objected.’‡

That I only abridge for brevity, will appear from my retaining that part of the sentence which Verax says is ‘ far the most material and pertinent to our subject.’ With the same view to brevity I shall pass over what he calls Penn’s commentary thereon, and proceed to his reply to the last and most important objection.

‘ Lastly, if it be alleged, that this will take in all parties, yea,
 ‘ that schismatics and heretics will creep in under this general
 ‘ confession, since few of them will refuse to make it, I do say
 ‘ it would be a happy day;—but to shew you that neither true
 ‘ schismatic—nor true heretic—can ever shelter himself under
 ‘ this common confession of Christianity, sincerely made, let us
 ‘ consider that whoever so declares Jesus to be the Messiah
 ‘ and anointed Saviour of God to men, must be supposed to
 ‘ believe all that of him, with respect to which he is so called.
 ‘ Now that for which he is so denominated, is that which God

* Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 754. † 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.

‡ Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 756.

‘ sent him to do : the reason and end of his coming he could best tell, who hath told us thus, “ I am come, that ye may have life, and that ye may have it more abundantly.” The world was dead in trespasses and sins, the guilt and defilement of transgression had killed the soul as to spiritual life and motion; and from under this powerful death, he came to redeem the soul unto life.—The way he took to accomplish this blessed work, was first, to preach repentance, and the approach of the kingdom of God, which is his rule and authority in the hearts of men; and that brings to the second thing to be believed, namely, *What he taught*.—His doctrine led men to repentance: Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand. No man could receive the kingdom of God, whilst he lived under the kingdom and power of Satan. Wherefore I conclude, that such as have not been acquainted with this holy repentance, do not sincerely believe, neither can rightly confess Jesus to be the Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour of the world. Therefore saith the apostle, “ Let him that nameth the name of the Lord, depart from iniquity.” And, saith the apostle in another place, “ No man can call Jesus Lord, but by the Holy Ghost;” which opens to us the nature of the true confession we ought to make, and which, being truly made in a *Scripture** sense, makes us Christians in a right

* The Appeal says ‘ *Christian* sense.’ Did its author mean that it is not to be made in a ‘ *Scripture* sense?’ The same motives, it is to be feared, induced him to take this liberty with Penn, as led him not to give the quotation from 2 Tim. iii. 16. in Penn’s Words, in the extract quoted in the last page. One of the reasons he assigns, in reply to Vindex, for not citing this text as Penn has it, is the very reason why he should have preserved a rigid fidelity to his author, ‘ I avoided giving it,’ says Verax, ‘ as he (Penn) has quoted it—because I conceived others had mistaken its true import.’ Was not Penn as capable of judging of this as himself? If the variation does not alter Penn’s sense, as he pleads, why vary at all? If it does, nothing that he has advanced to exculpate himself, will justify the liberty he has taken in *not faithfully* transcribing the words of his author; the authority of Barclay will not avail him in this instance, for as Vindex says, ‘ Penn (*though he published this, about a year after the English Apology came out, and three years after the Latin*) doth not quote the text, 2 Tim. iii. 16. in Barclay’s way; but according to the present version.’* By this passage we see Verax’s manner of citing Vindex; he had no doubt a very cogent reason for omitting the part in italic; viz. because with it the passage was *unanswerable*. Verax’s arguments against ‘ the *pienary*’ (or *organic*) ‘ inspiration of the present canon of Scripture’ are opposed to a phantom raised by himself. But he has yet to find arguments of

* Examination, p. 31, 32.

' Christian acception; to wit, That the true confession of
 ' Jesus to be both Lord and Christ is from such a belief in the
 ' heart as is accompanied with the embracing and practising of
 ' his holy doctrine; such a faith is the work of the Holy
 ' Ghost, and those that do not so confess him, or call upon him,
 ' that is, by virtue of the overshadowing of the Divine Spirit and
 ' power, are not truly Christians, true worshippers, or believers
 ' and disciples of our Lord Jesus. Furthermore, they that
 ' receive Christ, receive his kingdom, his power and authority
 ' in their souls, whereby the strong man that kept the house
 ' becomes bound, and his goods spoiled by this stronger man,
 ' the Lord's Christ, who is come from heaven to dwell in us and
 ' be the hope of our glory; for so he was preached to the gentiles.
 ' This kingdom, the apostle tells us, stands in righteousness,
 ' peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost, and Christ tells us where it
 ' is to be set up. "The kingdom of God is within you," says the
 ' King himself, and where should the King be but in his own
 ' kingdom?—so that no man can truly confess and rightly
 ' believe Jesus to be the Christ and Son of God, who does not
 ' receive him to be his King, to rule his heart and affections.—
 ' But because it may be expected that I should fix upon some
 ' few general heads of Christian doctrine from the mouth of
 ' Christ and his apostles, as requisite to Christian communion,
 ' I should proceed to mention what Christ eminently taught.*

After enumerating several of the evangelical precepts of
 Christ, he proceeds thus: ' Indeed he' (Christ) ' gave his life for
 ' the world, and offered up one common sacrifice for mankind :
 ' and by this one offering up of himself, once for all, he hath
 ' for ever perfected, that is, quitted and discharged, and taken
 ' into favour, them that are sanctified.—This holy offering up
 ' of himself by the Eternal Spirit, is a great part of his *Messiah-*
 ' *ship*; for therein he hath both confirmed his blessed message
 ' of remission of sins and life everlasting, to as many as truly
 ' believe in his name, and hath given himself a propitiation for
 ' all that have sinned, and thereby come short of the glory of
 ' God; insomuch that God is said by the apostle Paul to "be
 "just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus, whom
 "God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his
 "blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins
 "that are past, through the forbearance of God." Unto
 ' which I shall join his *Mediatorship* or *Advocacy*, linked together
 ' both by the apostle of the gentiles, and the beloved disciple
 ' John: the first in these words, "For there is one God, and one

more weight, than any hitherto produced, to prove that our first friends
 did not believe in ' the authenticity of the present canon of Scripture.'

“ *Mediator* between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who
 “ gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time:”
 “ the apostle John expresseth it thus: “ My little children, these
 “ things write I unto you, that ye sin not; and if any man sin,
 “ we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, the righ-
 “ teous; he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours
 “ only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” ‘ So that to
 ‘ be brief, the *Christian Creed*, so far as it is declaratory, lies
 ‘ eminently in a confession of these particulars: of the divine
 ‘ authority of the New, as well as of the Old Testament
 ‘ writings, and particularly of these great, general, and obvious
 ‘ truths therein expressed, to wit, Of God and Christ, his
 ‘ *miracles*, doctrine, death, *resurrection*, advocateship or medi-
 ‘ ation, the gift of his light, spirit, or grace; of faith and
 ‘ repentance from dead works unto remission of sins, keeping
 ‘ his commandments, and lastly, of eternal recompense. Less,
 ‘ once, than all this would have done; and it does not show
 ‘ the age more Christian, but more curious, indeed more *infidel*
 ‘ to be sure, more captious and froward, that there is this stir
 ‘ made about external creeds of communion; for distrust of
 ‘ brethren, and *incredulity* among Christians, are no small signs
 ‘ of their decay of faith towards God: from the beginning it
 ‘ was not so.*”

If W. Penn had to regret that the infidelity and incredulity of his time prevented the simple confession of faith adopted in the apostolic age, from being sufficient in his day, is it likely to be sufficient at a time, when infidelity and incredulity assume even the form of Christianity?

Brief as W. Penn’s *Christian Creed* is, in which he only includes what he considered as the most material points of Christianity, so as to embrace all the true disciples and followers of Christ, whether Churchmen, Presbyterians, Quakers, or others, for he seems to have avoided noticing those less important points, respecting which these denominations are divided from each other; I say brief and comprehensive as W. Penn’s Creed is, Hannah Barnard is unavoidably excluded by it, as it necessarily includes a belief in *historical facts*, which all Christian creeds must, and she refused to acknowledge or confess her belief in the *miracles* and *resurrection* of Christ, because she did not think the Friends ought to make a belief in *historical facts*, an article of faith necessary to qualify for Christian communion. But even if she could have subscribed to this short creed, it would prove nothing to the purpose; it could not prove that she was a Quaker. The Friends do not unchristianize or anathematize all those who do not conform to them, all those who will not

unite with them in objecting to the lawfulness of war, or to the propriety of a minister of the gospel receiving tithes; neither do they desire to impose upon others their own peculiar mode of worship, or views of the gospel, under the penalty of being stigmatized for schismatics or heretics, if they do not conform to them.

I think Verax has done his cause no good by his introduction of Penn's *Address to Protestants*, for if that work proves any thing, it can only be—that H. Barnard is no Christian, and that W. Penn believed in the divine authority of the books of the Old and New Testament, and even considered this belief necessary to a true faith in the gospel of Christ. I shall conclude my evidences of W. Penn's belief in the Scriptures with one more extract taken from his *Testimony to the Truth, as held by the people called Quakers*.

‘Concerning the Holy Scriptures. Because we assert the Holy Spirit to be the first great and general rule and guide of true Christians, as that by which God is worshipped, sin detected, conscience convicted, duty manifested, Scripture unfolded and explained, and consequently the rule for understanding the Scriptures themselves (since by it they were at first given forth), from hence our adversaries are pleased to make us blasphemers of the Holy Scriptures, undervaluing their authority, preferring our own books before them, with more to that purpose: whereas we, in truth and sincerity, believe them to be of divine authority, given by the inspiration of God, through holy men, they speaking or writing them as they were moved by the Holy Ghost: that they are a declaration of those things most surely believed by the primitive Christians, and that as they contain the mind and will of God, and are his commands to us; so they, in that respect, are his declaratory word, and therefore are obligatory on us, and are “profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, and thoroughly furnished to every good work.”—We both love, honour, and prefer them before all books in the world; ever choosing to express our belief of the Christian faith and doctrine in the terms thereof, and rejecting all principles and doctrines whatsoever, that are repugnant thereunto.’

‘Nevertheless we are well persuaded, that notwithstanding there is such an excellency in the Holy Scriptures, as we have above declared, yet the unstable and unlearned in Christ's school too often wrest them to their own destruction. And upon our reflection on their carnal constructions of them, we are made undervaluers of Scripture itself. But certain it is, that as the Lord hath been pleased to give us the experience of the fulfilling of them in measure, so it is altogether contrary

‘ to our faith and practice, to put any manner of slight or contempt upon them, much more of being guilty of what maliciously is suggested against us; since no Society of professed Christians in the world, can have a more reverend and honourable esteem for them than we have. John iv. 24. and xvi. 8. Rom. i. 19. Luke i. 1, 2. 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. 2 Pet. iii. 16.’*

This is one of W. Penn’s latter pieces, written in the year 1698, in which he, briefly, but fully, states what he does, and what he does not believe respecting the Scriptures. The reader will now be enabled to judge, by the evidence before him, whether the same doubts respecting the authenticity of the Scripture impressed the minds of Barclay and Penn, that evidently prevail in that of the author of the Appeal? Whether when Barclay and Penn say, that after the Spirit they ‘ freely concede to the Scripture the second place,’ that they mentally intended, ‘ with some *considerable exceptions*.’ Unless he can suppose that they were so disingenuous, he must see that there is not merely a seeming, but a real difference between them and Verax; for the latter, speaking of the Scripture ranking next to the Holy Spirit, says, ‘ I must either accede to it, with some *considerable exceptions*, or confine the admission to the more ‘ excellent parts.’†

Although Richard Morris’s Treatise on the Scriptures is not quoted in the first part of the Appeal, yet it being connected with the subject now under consideration, and also mentioned by Verax, in his ‘ Vindication,’ I cannot close this chapter without rescuing Morris’s Treatise from the service into which H. Barnard and Verax have endeavoured to press it. The title of the work will throw considerable light upon the drift of the writer’s argument. I will recite it.

‘ Some animadversions on the supposition of the Scriptures ‘ being the only, principal, and perfect rule to salvation; which ‘ are no way intended to lessen any real respect due to them, but ‘ to provoke the professors of religion to an impartial enquiry ‘ after, and attention to, that which is and ever was, the living, ‘ ancient, unalterable, universal rule, viz. The Spirit, Light, ‘ or Grace of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. By Richard ‘ Morris, &c. 1 John ii. 27. “ Ye need not that any man “ teach you; but as the same anointing teacheth you all “ things, and is truth.” ‘ R. Barclay’s Apology, page 86.’ “ We also are very willing to admit it as a positive certain “ maxim, that whatsoever any do, pretending to the Spirit, “ which is contrary to the Scriptures, be accounted and reckoned a delusion of the devil.”

* Penn’s Works, Vol. II. 878.

† Vindication, p. 120.

Now the charge against Hannah Barnard was that she had inculcated what is *contrary* to the Scriptures. Will her application to Morris's Treatise shelter her here? Can she availingly enlist him under her banner? Whether the charge preferred against her be false or true, will be considered hereafter.

It may be proper to apologize to the reader for further detaining him, by the introduction of Morris's pamphlet, as the subject-matter of it has been so amply discussed in the preceding pages, but the great stress that has been laid upon the above-mentioned piece, renders it necessary, lest my silence should be interpreted as a fear to meet the subject; united on my part with a desire to prevent the necessity of resuming the pen to remove future objections.

From the title it is evident the writer is addressing himself to those who suppose the Scriptures to be the *only principal and perfect rule to salvation*, who consequently place the Scriptures above the Spirit; to such the following questions are very appropriate.

'If the Holy Scriptures be the rule, I desire to know whether
'all from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Revelation
'be the rule, or only some part of them be so? I say, is all that
'relates to the laws of Moses, the genealogies, all that Job's
'friends said, the rule?' &c.

These, and the questions that follow, contain not a single word, either against the authenticity of the Scriptures, or contradicting the title page, by admitting doctrines to be promulgated, that are 'contrary to the Scriptures.' A remark of Vindex, respecting a quotation from W. Penn, by Verax, will be, once for all, a sufficient reply to all passages of this sort. 'He' (Penn) 'mentions indeed,' says Vindex, 'as in the part already
'adverted to, that there are many parts of Scripture, which,
'though true in themselves, can be no rule for us. This is
'easily granted, when we recollect that the Scriptures contain
'recitals of not only the acts of bad men, but of holy men
'placed in circumstances far different from those in which we
'live, and under a less perfect dispensation.*

'Now, though we freely acknowledge the Holy Scriptures,' says R. Morris, 'giving them preference to all other writings
'in the world; and consequently *must* acknowledge the testimony borne by them; as, "Whatsoever things were written
"aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through
"patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope."
'And "The Holy Scriptures are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus," &c. Yet

‘ that they are not, but that an inward living one is, the principal, perfect, universal rule and guide, may abundantly appear from many texts of the same, as 1 John ii. 20. 27. John vi. 45, &c. &c. For if it be impossible to give a blind or deaf man a true idea of colours or sounds, by any outward descriptions of them; then neither can any outward description, or verbal testimony *alone*, give any man a true knowledge of the things of God.’

Does the assertion that we *must* acknowledge the testimony borne by the Scriptures, imply that we *may refuse* to acknowledge the testimony borne by them? Morris enforces, and that with much sound argument, the necessity of immediate revelation to understand the divine truths contained in the Scriptures, and that this revelation must be our principal rule and guide, indeed, that without it, the spiritual truths of the Scriptures will be as unintelligible to us, as colours to a blind man. R. Morris next shows, agreeably to the third section of the third Proposition of Barclay’s Apology, that the Scriptures cannot be a rule to us in all things, for instance :

‘ The Scriptures tell us,’ says Morris, ‘ we should do, or not do, such and such things, but do not, (what if I say, cannot) tell us what we do : which is called by some, *de jure & de facto*. The Scripture, indeed, saith, “ Be not proud.” “ Beware of covetousness, which is idolatry.” “ Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” “ Thou shalt not hate thy brother.”—“ Thou shalt love the Lord thy God,”—&c. Which things no outward testimony can give me the true knowledge of ;—seeing then, that the true knowledge and observation of these things, with many more, exceedingly concern our everlasting well-being ; it is very necessary we should have something near, whereby we may know whether we are guilty of the things forbidden, and in the practice of those enjoined. But the Scriptures cannot tell me whether I am proud, covetous, I lust, hate, or love God with all my heart, and my neighbour as myself ; have such charity as the giving the body to be burned is no certain sign of,’ &c. That I say, which shows me these things truly and intuitively, must be some living principle, even in the mind or heart, viz. the light, spirit, or grace of God, to which the Holy Scriptures do amply witness, and without the guidance of this light, spirit, or grace, the Scriptures may truly, without disrespect, be esteemed as a dead letter. Some may think they have an answer for this ready enough ; and tell us that the light of nature, or a natural conscience, reason, or the heart of man, is sufficient for these things.—Now, is this any honour to God, his grace, or spirit, that natural reason, the light of nature,

‘ &c. should have the preference to his heavenly light and spirit, ‘ as a more certain guide to be depended on? Is not the heart of man said to be “deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked.”—“ And that the imagination of the thoughts “ of his heart was only evil continually.” So the Scriptures ‘ are so far from directing us to examine, interpret, and understand them, by any of the faculties of man in his own nature, ‘ that they not only give us the abovesaid warnings, but further ‘ tell us, “ God,” saith Paul, “ hath revealed them unto us by “ his Spirit; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep “ things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, ‘ save the spirit of man, which is in him? even so the things “ of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. But the “ natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; ‘ for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, ‘ because they are spiritually discerned.” ‘ No doubt but Paul ‘ here spoke of men who had natural reason; and so no question ‘ had Christ’s disciples when he told them, “ I have yet many “ things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now. How- ‘ beit, when the Spirit of Truth is come.”—“ It seems they ‘ wanted the further assistance and openings of the Spirit; but ‘ were not directed to their natural reason and abilities.—So then, ‘ there is no safety, no assurance of the things belonging to the ‘ kingdom of God, or knowledge of him, but by being taught ‘ by the Comforter, “ by the teaching of the anointing.”

This part of R. Morris’s pamphlet I would recommend to Verax’s serious and impartial perusal, as the latter by the general tenor of his reasoning, seems to lay more stress upon human learning, and the reason of man, as the means to attain to the right knowledge of the Scriptures, than upon this inward revelation, though I do not say he has denied this inward gift of grace—whilst he retains the mask of a Quaker, he cannot consistently do it. These may seem harsh expressions; Verax cannot, however, be surprised at them, when he reflects upon the guile that has been practised; when he reflects that the phrases, *Revelation, the Spirit, the free gift and grace of God*, have been applied to human reason.*

* The writer I advert to is John Hancock, who says, ‘ Conscience ‘ is the manifestation of the will of God made in the hearts of all men, ‘ the divinity in man—is called the grace of God, his unspeakable gift ‘ —the measure of his spirit given to profit withal, and is described by ‘ various figures expressive of its operation—the light, because it makes ‘ manifest—the talent committed to us to occupy with.’ In another tract this author says, ‘ Revelation is a simple, inward principle in the ‘ heart’—‘ the free gift, the grace of God’—a ‘ ray of the divinity in ‘ man’—‘ a principle divine in its nature—divine power in the heart,’ &c. Who would suspect that the writer of the foregoing only meant human

If Verax say, he is not responsible for what others may have advanced, in the instance I immediately refer to, I admit he is not : but the similarity of sentiment between John Hancock, to whom I allude, and H. Barnard, respecting most of the points for which she was disunited from our Society, joined with the ambiguity of the phrases she has adopted, when speaking of divine revelation,* justify my suspicions that there is a dislimi-

reason by these various expressions? Does it not appear harsh even to surmise such a thing? I should have thought so, had he not said a little further on in this same tract—‘Conscience is the gift of God—so also is reason, and as they both proceed from him, so they must be in unison together. Some have attempted to make a distinction between them; but I apprehend it has arisen from not taking a comprehensive view of the subject.—If pure revelation, unmixed conscience, and sound reason be closely examined, I think they will be found all to proceed from the same source, and if they are not united as one common principle, the error of supposing they may be one and the same thing under different names will not, I expect, be a practical evil; I acknowledge for my own part, I cannot clearly separate them, and I believe a critical attempt to do so, would partake more of the nature of barren speculation, than of practical utility.’

A critical attempt to distinguish or separate reason from revelation, is likely to be productive of the same effects, as a critical attempt to distinguish or separate the creature from the Creator. But an attempt to confound them together, as John Hancock has done, ‘is, with respect to the intellectual world, the exact counterpart of the doctrine of Spinoza, respecting the material world.’ From the example adduced of John Hancock’s licentious phraseology, and which can be considered no otherwise than as a dangerous abuse of language, we must not be disappointed if his writings contain some contradictory propositions; thus, in other parts of them, he seems to make a distinction between the heart of man as the recipient, and the Spirit of God as a supernatural gift imparted to it, but his closing explanation already mentioned confounds all distinction between the gift and that which receives it. What constitutes the essential difference between a man and a beast? is it not his reason? What constitutes the essential difference between a child of God and an unregenerate man? is it because the latter has lost his rational faculties, or rather, is it not because the former is not guided merely by his own natural reason, but by the Spirit of God? Can this distinction be said to partake of the nature of barren speculation? ‘Is not that which enlightens, and that which is enlightened, distinct? Is not that in man which makes him capable to perceive, &c. and that which is made capable, two different things? But to put the matter out of all doubt, If it be God himself who illuminates man, are not God and man distinct? And if God does this immediately, he is certainly present with them for that purpose; and if so, they have something else to trust to, besides their own reason fallible as it may be.’ (Arscott’s Considerations, &c. 3d Edit. p. 110.)

* H. Barnard in her Summary speaks of ‘Christ within, the Hope of

larity between her and the Friends, respecting their belief in this inward principle; neither does what Verax has advanced in his *Sequel to the Appeal*, page 100, tend to remove my doubts respecting his own sincere belief in divine inspiration.

To return from this, I hope not altogether useless, digression to R. Morris; after distinguishing between ‘the Spirit of God’ which gave forth the Scriptures,’ and the ‘natural reason’ of man, he says:—

‘This,’ (the Spirit of God) ‘therefore has been, and is, the universal rule or guide, with respect to all times and places when and where the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament never came, or were known, as well as where they are: “The Lord hath made known his salvation; his righteousness hath he openly shown in the sight of the heathen: all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God. The Lord is good to all; and his tender mercies are over all his works.” “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” “In him was life, and the life was the light of men.” “That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world.” “And this is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil. For every one that doeth evil, hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved.” “But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal.” “For the grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men.” “Therefore, as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.” “After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands.” “Then Peter opened his mouth, and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.”

‘Glory,’ and of ‘putting on Christ.’—In her reply to some *Remarks upon her Summary* she adopts the language of the Friends respecting ‘the government of Christ’s Spirit in the heart’ as harmonizing with her sentiments (see *Some Tracts relating to the Controversy between H. B. and Friends*, p. 2, 22, 42 to 44.) Must not these phrases be used in an unusual sense, when adopted by those who believe Christ to be only a mere man? If such believe in two Christs they ought candidly to say so, and not mislead us by using scriptural language to express antiscipitural opinions.

“ For when the gentiles, which have not the law, do by
 “ nature the things contained in the law, these having not the
 “ law are a law unto themselves ; which show the work of
 “ the law written in their hearts ; their conscience also bearing
 “ witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else
 “ excusing one another.” “ Some of their own poets said,”
 “ that “ in him (i. e. in God), we live, and move, and have
 “ our being.” “ I shall willingly grant that the Christians have
 “ had the advantage of the gentiles, as Paul did concerning the
 “ Jews ; and that “ much every way ; chiefly because,” “ faith
 “ he,” “ unto them were committed the oracles of God,” (which
 “ may well be referred to the dispensation of Moses ; and his
 “ antitype Jesus Christ), which the Jews had, and we have the
 “ advantage of, more than the heathen : although every speech
 “ from God in the heart of man, may be truly called the oracle
 “ of God—Let it then be allowed, that the Christian world has
 “ received five talents, and the gentiles but two or one ; the
 “ question then is, Whether two talents, or one, is not capable
 “ of improvement or advantage, to the salvation of the soul that
 “ honestly joins with the blessed efficacy of it. “ There is one glory
 “ of the sun, and another glory of the moon, and another glory
 “ of the stars ; for one star differeth from another star in glory.”
 “ But it is a hard thing for many Christians to conceive how
 “ the gentiles should come to salvation (though they would wil-
 “ lingly exercise charity towards them), seeing they lack the be-
 “ nefit of the Holy Scriptures, and the advantage of the learned
 “ to explain them ; and to draw from thence, and their own
 “ conceptions, the necessary Christian Creeds ; whereby they
 “ might have a true knowledge of God, needful to their salva-
 “ tion. Of such I would ask, how they are assured, many of
 “ them have not as true knowledge of God as many of those
 “ called Christians.—If we were to judge by the fruits of both
 “ sides, one might reasonably think that many of each of them,
 “ both Christians and Heathens, had not much knowledge or
 “ belief of God Almighty.—“ I would ask any one, of what
 “ extent the confession, or how large or particular the Creed
 “ must be, to answer the expectation of such as question the
 “ means of salvation afforded the Heathen ? That we or they
 “ may have ground to believe they are in a capacity of salvation,
 “ must they believe and understand the Creed of Athanasius, and
 “ every article thereof, as delivered in the liturgy of the Church
 “ of England ? which says, that “ Whosoever will be saved, be-
 “ fore all things, it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith ;
 “ which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled,
 “ without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.” Surely every un-
 “ derstanding man must grant this a hard lesson, even respect-
 “ ing the Trinity itself, as it is there expressed ; which the

‘learned have been, and yet are, at irreconcilable odds about, though under the same profession and community: so that, if what they further say be true, viz. that “He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity;” what a doubtful condition will very many of their own church be in, as well as the Pagans and Mahometans!’

Wherein do these arguments reach the case of H. Barnard? Is she a Heathen that has only received one talent? Is there nothing more required of a Christian who has received the oracles of God, than of a Heathen? Are not Morris’s arguments intended simply to prove the absurdity, to say nothing worse, of pronouncing damnation against all those who do not receive our own Creed, whether acquainted with the Scriptures or not, thereby excluding the poor Heathen from the means of salvation?

After pointing out the difficulty there is for ‘any man, or society, to determine precisely the number of articles and extent of that creed, without which a man *cannot be saved*,’ and the inefficacy of creeds without ‘the inward revelation of God in the heart.’ Morris concludes his treatise with these words, which sum up his whole argument.

‘To conclude; by what has been said it appears, That the Bible, or Holy Scriptures, that we now have (and neither more nor less), cannot be THE Rule and Standard of Truth, whereby all things relating to divine affairs are to be proved and tried: but that we must depend on some other thing, which is abundantly testified of in those Holy Scriptures, which we yet enjoy the comfort of.—For as the whole world has need of salvation, and consequently of a Saviour; so God is willing all men should be saved, and come unto the knowledge of the truth. Therefore Christ gave himself a ransom for all. Now, though nothing were outwardly written for the upholding of the devil’s kingdom, few or none will doubt but he is able and ready to teach, and draw by his inward suggestions, abundantly to those things that are wicked: so if we do not allow that God, by his Holy Spirit, is as able and ready to teach and draw by his inward directions and divine grace, out of wickedness into righteousness, where outward writings are wanting, then we should insinuate that God is not so much concerned to save, as the devil is, to destroy; nor would the remedy be as extensive and efficacious as the disease; which, how absurd, if not blasphemous, a thing were it to suppose!’

Verax hesitates respecting ‘the precise ideas of this writer,’ when he personifies the source of all evil; this hesitation must be attributed rather to his own unbelief of the existence of any such being as a devil or spirit, than to any obscurity in the language

of this author, who has unequivocally expressed his belief in the existence of such a spirit.

We have now before us the leading features of this pamphlet; by which it can be ascertained whether its contents are or are not consistent with the title, whether it contains any thing in it that militates against the authenticity and authority of the Scriptures, or against their being an outward rule of faith and practice; also, whether by making Christ's mediation as extensive and efficacious, as Adam's fall was injurious, to mankind; the writer intended to encourage an indifference respecting the truths of the gospel among professing Christians.

With regard to this latter subject, which seems to be more particularly adverted to by Verax, I shall observe, that the distinction R. Morris draws between that essential faith, without which no man, whether he be called Heathen or Christian, can be saved, and that particular faith required of those unto whom 'are committed the oracles of God;' is no other than what Barclay makes in the 5th and 6th Propositions of his Apology, quoted in my letter to John Evans, pages 13 and 14. The 'glaring inconsistency,' and 'the striking variance,' Verax pretends to discover between the Friends' approbation of the book, and their subsequent conduct towards H. Barnard, would apply with equal force to R. Barclay himself. It remains yet to be explained how R. Barclay and his friends could consistently unite in religious fellowship with those whose doctrines they detested and held as sacrilegious.

When our Society denominates all those who do not receive its faith and embrace its communion, *Heretics* or *Schismatics*, and denies them to be *Christians*; then may Verax triumphantly produce Barclay, Penn, and Morris, as testimonies against its intolerant zeal and bigotry.

CHAP. VII.

The specific Charges against HANNAH BARNARD, as they are severally stated in the Appeal, examined, and the Objections to them answered.— On the Divine commands for the wars of the Jews.

IN the preceding chapters I have followed Verax in his investigation of our early friends' sentiments on those doctrinal points, wherein he thinks he has discovered an agreement between them and Hannah Barnard; and also imagines he sees a dissonance between them, and the 'principal and fundamental' points of faith' professed by the present Friends: but in tracing the paths that, he thinks, have led to these discoveries, the medium through which we have viewed the same objects must have been very different, since the whole I can discover convinces me that the doctrines of our Society have undergone no variation, that the tenets inculcated by it, and preached by its ministers at its first rise, are the same which are opposed by Verax, as 'in strict contradiction to the necessary and essential' articles of the Christian faith.' Which of us has viewed these objects through a *right* medium, I leave to others to decide.

The next subject to be considered is the nature and complexion of the charges exhibited against H. Barnard, including those opinions, for inculcating which she was first silenced as a minister, and afterwards disowned as a member of our religious Society. I shall first state the charges, and afterwards adopt the order pursued by Verax in his strictures on them. The charges are, 'That she promoted a disbelief of some parts of the Old Testament, particularly those parts which assert that the Almighty commanded the Israelites to make war

‘ upon other nations :—in which, also, she includes the command given to Abraham, to offer up his son Isaac. It further appears, that she is not one with Friends in her belief respecting various parts of the New Testament, particularly relating to the miraculous conception, and miracles of Christ.’

Although H. Barnard has not put her signature to the *Appeal* and *Sequel*, yet as she has unquestionably furnished the materials for these works, we may infer that the defence of her sentiments, contained in them, is approved by her. Verax has divided the charge against her into four articles, and upon these he has severally animadverted.

1st. ‘ That she promoted a disbelief of some parts of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, particularly those which assert that the Almighty commanded the Israelites to make war upon other nations.’*

This charge he represents to be founded on the following declaration of H. B.’s, ‘ that war is in itself, and ever was, a moral evil, which man creates to himself, by the misapplication of his powers, or, in other words, by the abuse of his free agency.’† Allowing, that H. B. had, in the select yearly meeting, expressed words to this import, we cannot admit that the proposition comprises an open avowal of her sentiments, or that it was the sole or principal ground of the charge against her.—Its ambiguity was well calculated to produce an apparent diversity of sentiment in the select yearly meeting. A member who was present, on noticing the observation in the Appeal, that there appeared ‘ a difference in sentiment,’ remarks, ‘ that the ambiguity with which H. B. expressed herself, oftentimes rendered her meaning obscure; thus the meeting has been charged with *diversity of sentiment*, when that diversity, which was small, arose from the various constructions put on her words.’

The following statement of H. B.’s opinion more clearly exhibits the origin of the charge, than that given by her advocate. ‘ That in no age of the world, the great and merciful Creator ever commissioned any nation or person to destroy another, but that they were formerly, as at present, only permitted so to do.’‡ Let us examine, whether disseminating this sentiment does, or does not, promote a disbelief in some parts of the Scriptures. H. B. has thus expressed herself on this point.—‘ And I remark that my different construction of the sense or import of those passages in the Old Testament, relative to the subject of war, ought not, in my judgment, to be construed to amount to a disbelief, any more than the same liberty taken by Thomas Ellwood and others, respecting those

* Appeal, p. 72. † Sequel to the Appeal. p. 5. ‡ Appeal, p. 194.

‘ passages wherein it is expressly said, that the Almighty hardened the heart of Pharaoh; that is, says Thomas Ellwood, “ he suffered it to be hardened.”*’

Hannah Barnard endeavours to avail herself of the maxim, that no one is to be charged with the consequences that may appear to us as the natural result of his positions, when such consequences are rejected by him. But some positions involve in themselves consequences which cannot possibly be separated from them—this is true of the instance before us; for example, the Scriptures say, ‘ The Lord said unto Moses,’ and ‘ The Lord spake unto Joshua the son of Nun,’ which are succeeded by commands to Moses and Joshua, to make war upon the Canaanites, &c. whereas H. B. says, the Lord gave no such commands. Is not this denying the truth of the Scripture records? Can the consequence be avoided? Can we believe and disbelieve a thing at the same instant?

The case of Pharaoh is not parallel with the consideration; whether Moses, Joshua, Gideon, &c. received these divine commands, the Scriptures say they did receive. In the latter instance the truth of the text is involved in the consideration, in the former it is not: for Thomas Ellwood was so far from questioning the text, that he adopts it, simply subjoining how he understands it, and which, I believe, coincides with the generally received opinion with regard to the operations of the Spirit of God upon the mind; that is to say, when a man is judicially hardened, it is by God’s leaving him to himself, and ceasing to strive with him; for when the divine influence is wholly withdrawn from the mind, we are forsaken and rejected of God, and delivered up to our natural innate depravity, which produces hardness of heart, and enmity to the ways of God.

If H. B. instead of questioning the truth of the divine commands recorded in the Scriptures, had merely advanced her conjectures respecting the *manner* in which the word of the Lord was communicated to the prophets, this liberty would bear a comparison with T. Ellwood’s, as then in each case the fidelity of the text would not be attacked.

In order to ascertain whether her sentiments with regard to the Jewish wars ‘ ought not to be construed to amount to a disbelief of those passages in the Old Testament,’ in which the divine command for, and approval of, those wars is expressed, I shall cite a few of them :

‘ Behold, I send an angel before thee to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice,—do all that I speak; then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies, and an adversary unto

‘ thine adversaries. For mine angel shall go before thee, and
 ‘ bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, and the
 ‘ Perizzites, and the Canaanites, the Hivites, and the Jebu-
 ‘ sites; and I will cut them off—I will send my fear before
 ‘ thee, and will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come.
 ‘ And I will make all thine enemies turn their backs unto thee.
 ‘ And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out
 ‘ the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite, from before thee.
 ‘ I will not drive them out from before thee in one year, lest
 ‘ the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply
 ‘ against thee. By little and little I will drive them out from
 ‘ before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land—
 ‘ They shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin
 ‘ against me: for if thou serve their gods, it will surely be a
 ‘ snare unto thee.’*

‘ And he,’ (God) ‘ said, Behold, I make a covenant: before
 ‘ all thy people I will do marvels, such as have not been done
 ‘ in all the earth, nor in any nation: and all the people among
 ‘ which thou art shall see the work of the Lord: for it is a ter-
 ‘ rible thing that I will do with thee. Observe thou that which I
 ‘ command thee this day; behold I drive out before thee the
 ‘ Amorite, and the Canaanite, &c. Take heed to thyself, lest
 ‘ thou make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land whither
 ‘ thou goest, lest it be for a snare in the midst of thee: but ye
 ‘ shall destroy their altars, break their images, and cut down
 ‘ their groves: for thou shalt worship no other god,’ &c.†

Upon the children of Reuben, and of Gad, and the half tribe of
 Manasseh requesting to have their inheritance allotted them on
 the wilderness side of Jordan; Moses granted their request upon
 condition that they would go armed with the rest of the Israelites
 over Jordan, and assist them in obtaining their inheritance be-
 yond Jordan, saying, ‘ If ye will do this thing, if ye will go
 ‘ armed before the Lord, to war, and will go all of you armed
 ‘ over Jordan before the Lord, until he hath driven out his
 ‘ enemies from before him, and the land be subdued before the
 ‘ Lord; then afterwards ye shall return, and be guiltless before
 ‘ the Lord.—But if ye will not do so, behold ye have sinned
 ‘ against the Lord, and be sure your sin will find you out.’‡

The Book of Joshua begins thus: ‘ Now after the death of
 ‘ Moses the servant of the Lord, it came to pass that the Lord
 ‘ spake unto Joshua the son of Nun, Moses’ minister, saying,
 ‘ Moses my servant is dead; now therefore arise, go over this
 ‘ Jordan, thou and all this people, unto the land which I do give
 ‘ to them, even to the children of Israel. Every place that the
 ‘ sole of your foot shall tread upon, that have I given unto you,’

* Exodus xxiii. 20 to 33.

† Ibid. xxxiv. 10 to 14.

‡ Numb. xxxii, 20 to 23.

‘ as I said unto Moses—‘ There shall not any man be able to
 ‘ stand before thee all the days of thy life: as I was with
 ‘ Moses, so I will be with thee, I will not fail thee, nor forsake
 ‘ thee. Be strong and of a good courage, for unto this people
 ‘ shalt thou divide for an inheritance the land which I swear
 ‘ unto their fathers to give them,—Only be thou strong and
 ‘ courageous, that thou mayst observe to do according to all the
 ‘ law, which Moses my servant commanded thee: turn not
 ‘ from it to the right hand or to the left, that thou mayst prosper
 ‘ whithersoever thou goest. This book of the law shall not de-
 ‘ part out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day
 ‘ and night, that thou mayst observe to do according to all that
 ‘ is written therein: for *then* thou shalt make thy way prosper-
 ‘ ous, and then thou shalt have good success.—Have not I com-
 ‘ manded thee? Be strong and of a good courage; be not afraid,
 ‘ neither be thou dismayed: for the Lord thy God is with thee
 ‘ whithersoever thou goest.’*

From these Scriptures we see that the children of Israel were not only commanded by the Lord to dispossess the Canaanites of their land, but that a disobedience to this divine command was pronounced to be a sin against the Lord which would not be committed with impunity. This is also confirmed by those historical facts, the truth of which H. B. professes not to deny.—For of the twelve spies that went to spy out the land of Canaan, ten of them ‘ died by the plague, before the Lord,’ because they discouraged the children of Israel from going to take possession of the land promised to their fathers.—If the commands in question were forgeries and never given by the Lord, should not the divine vengeance have fallen upon the heads of Caleb and Joshua who *supported* these fictitious commands, and should not the other ten spies have received the divine approbation for opposing them? whereas the event proves quite the reverse, for the lives of Caleb and Joshua were not only preserved, when their ten companions died of the plague, but for their good report, and endeavours, though unavailing, to prevent the people from being discouraged by the evil report of the other spies, they were permitted to enter the promised land, whilst the rest of the congregation that murmured and rebelled against the Lord, were condemned to die in the wilderness, for their want of faith in the divine promises.

The same difficulty attends almost the whole of the historical facts recorded in the Bible: for those who do not believe that Moses and Joshua acted by a divine commission, cannot rationally give credit to the miracles they are related to have wrought, by which the Israelites were supported and delivered from their

* Josh. i. 1 to 9.

various enemies, viz. the deliverance from Egyptian bondage by a whole chain of miracles,—their passage through the Red Sea on dry land—the same passage that favoured their flight, proving fatal to the Egyptians, who had the temerity to follow them—their support by manna during their sojourning in the wilderness, which was one continued miracle for the space of forty years—their passage on dry land through Jordan—the wall of the city of Jericho falling down flat at the shout of the children of Israel—the elements fighting for them against their enemies—Even the check they received at Ai, was only a confirmation of the divine mission of Joshua, who had pronounced the city of Jericho, and all in it, except Rahab and her family, accursed. See also the Epistle to the Hebrews, Chap. xi. 34, &c.

It follows therefore that H. B.'s endeavour to make it appear that she is a general believer of the Pentateuch, notwithstanding her disbelief of the divine commission of Moses and Joshua, is a vain attempt. And if to assert 'that in no age of the world, the great and merciful Creator ever commissioned any nation or person to destroy another,' can be considered by Verax, only as a different construction of the passages in the Old Testament, above cited, and that they 'ought not to be construed to amount to a disbelief' of them; let him no more complain of 'the idle acquiescence' of those, who, content with the primitive, apostolic doctrines, reject the innovating systems of our *rational* Christians.

Verax infers that we are no more authorized to attribute the success of the Israelites to a divine sanction of their wars, than to draw a similar conclusion in favour of their enemies, when the Lord delivered Israel into their hands; because the Scriptures generally ascribe the bad, as well as the good success of the Israelites, to the direct interference of the Almighty. The nature of the Jewish Theocracy affords, in itself, a sufficient reason why success in battle is almost uniformly ascribed to the direct interference of the Almighty; 'whether on the side of the Israelites, or of their idolatrous enemies,'* without deducing from such success on the part of their enemies, that they acted, as did the Israelites, in obedience to a divine command received from the Almighty—for do we not read that the word of the Lord came unto Chushan-rishathaim king of Mesopotamia, or to Eglon king of Moab, &c. This silence of the sacred records respecting any divine communication between God and the idolatrous enemies of Israel, constitutes one essential difference between them and the people of God—and destroys the force of the parallel Verax has made between them.

* Appeal, p. 73.

The single case of Gideon further evinces the fallacy of such reasoning. In the Sequel to the Appeal it is adverted to in a note upon a passage in a *private* letter of F. Smith's, wherein he says, that H. Barnard considers as erroneous 'the remarkable and striking immediate command to Gideon, and what follows, including divers evidences, by extraordinary signs of its being the will of God; and that by three hundred men only, the Midianites were completely overthrown. See Judges vi.' To this Verax replies,

'This chapter might have been as pertinently quoted, in proof of the divine sanction of the wars of the idolatrous Midianites, as in favour of the wars of the Jews, for the very first verse says—"And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord; and the Lord delivered them into the hand of Midian seven years." In the next chapter—Gideon is represented as using very similar language, addressed "*to the host of Israel.*"—"Arise, for the Lord hath delivered into your hand the host of Midian." The manner in which Gideon surprised the camp of the Midianites, "in the beginning of the middle watch," or about midnight, is next related. The confusion into which the Midianites were thrown by Gideon's singular stratagem, executed by three hundred chosen men, was improved into a total overthrow, by the assistance of "*the men of Israel*" who "*gathered themselves together out of Naphtali, and out of Asher, and out of all Manasseh, and pursued after the Midianites.*" So that it does not appear by the text, that "*the Midianites were completely overthrown—by three hundred men only.*"*

If Gideon's speech to his men had been the only proof of his divine mission, there would be some excuse for comparing it with what the historian says in the beginning of the 6th chapter; not that the comparison would even then bear, for the language of Gideon to his three hundred men was prophetic of their miraculous success over an army of one hundred and thirty-five thousand, and the truth of it was proved by the event. But it is not from language descriptive of the providence of God superintending the events recorded in Scripture, and which language is equally correct, whether the agents act from a divine sanction, or otherwise. I say, it is not from such general expressions, that we draw our proofs of the divine commands for the Jewish wars, no, we ground them upon their being expressly recorded as such in the sacred writings. As to the insinuation that the Midianites were not completely overthrown by Gideon's three hundred men only, let the text decide its validity.

After describing Gideon's division of his three hundred men into three companies, and his instructions to them, the account proceeds.

* Sequel to Appeal, p. 104.

‘ So Gideon, and the hundred men that were with him, came
 ‘ unto the outside of the camp in the beginning of the middle
 ‘ watch,—and they blew the trumpets, and broke the pitchers,
 ‘ that were in their hands. And the three companies blew the
 ‘ trumpets, and broke the pitchers, and held—the trumpets in
 ‘ their right hands to blow withal : and they cried, ‘ The sword of
 ‘ the Lord and of Gideon. And they stood every man in his place
 ‘ round about the camp : and all the host ran, and cried, and
 ‘ fled. And the three hundred blew the trumpets, and the Lord
 ‘ set every man’s sword against his fellow, even throughout all
 ‘ the host : and the host fled to Bethshittah in Zererath, and to
 ‘ the border of Abelmeholah, unto Tabbath.’* It was after
 Gideon had, through the Lord’s causing the Midianites to mis-
 take their own men for those of the enemy, *completely overthrown*
 them, that the men of Israel gathered themselves together,
 and joined Gideon in the pursuit of the enemy—Verax surely
 cannot be ignorant of the difference between fighting and rout-
 ing an army, and uniting in the pursuit of a flying enemy—
 the men of Ephraim were fully sensible of it, and ‘ chided with
 ‘ Gideon sharply’ for calling them only to assist in the pursuit.

Having replied to Verax’s endeavour to lessen the appearance
 of a divine interposition on behalf of Gideon and his small
 company,—I shall proceed to state what we consider unde-
 niable proofs of Gideon’s having acted by an immediate
 divine command, that the reader may see the disingenu-
 ity of Verax who passes over the whole of the sixth chapter
 of Judges, and the first part of the seventh, that he might place
 the proof of the divine mission of Gideon solely upon his ad-
 dress to the Israelites, just preceding their engagement with the
 Midianites.—This was one of the subjects that engaged the at-
 tention of the committee of the morning meeting in their con-
 ferences with H. Barnard ; and a member of that committee
 having furnished me with some minutes he made of what oc-
 curred on that occasion, I shall insert from them what relates to
 the divine command given to Gideon.

‘ Endeavours were made to convince her’ (H. B.’s) ‘ judg-
 ‘ ment respecting the authenticity of the divine commands for
 ‘ the wars of the Israelites, as recorded in the Old Testament,
 ‘ by pointing out some remarkable circumstances related there-
 ‘ in, as proof of such commands having been given ; among
 ‘ others a friend mentioned the following :—“ When Israel was
 “ oppressed by the Midianites, an angel appeared to Gideon, and
 “ in the name of the Lord commanded him to go against them :
 “ a sign was given him of its being a true message by the flesh
 “ and unleavened cakes being consumed on the Rock—yet

“ Gideon’s diffidence and modesty respecting himself was such
 “ that he dared not to proceed unless another sign were given
 “ him; to this the Lord condescended by the fleece being both
 “ wet and dry, as Gideon had desired. When the army of
 “ thirty-two thousand men was collected together, it is related,
 “ *The Lord said unto Gideon, The people that are with thee are too*
 “ *many for me to give the Midianites into their hands, lest Israel*
 “ *vaunt themselves against me, saying, Mine own hand hath saved*
 “ *me, &c.*” ‘ They were then reduced to ten thousand.—
 “ *And the Lord said unto Gideon, The people are yet too many, &c.*
 “ *And the Lord said unto Gideon, By the three hundred men that*
 “ *lapped will I save you, and deliver the Midianites into thine hand,*
 “ *&c.* and by them the Midianites were completely over-
 “ thrown.” ‘ To this she said, she did not dispute the historic
 ‘ fact, but she did not believe it was a divine command.’

In addition to these remarks, it also appears that these various
 assurances of divine help, were insufficient to preserve Gideon
 from being disheartened by the consideration of the great dis-
 proportion of his handful of men with the multitudes he was
 about to engage, therefore ‘ *the Lord said unto him, Arise, get*
 ‘ *thee down unto the host, for I have delivered it into thine hand.*
 ‘ But if thou fear to go down, go thou with Phurah thy ser-
 ‘ vant down to the host: and thou shalt hear what they say; and
 ‘ afterwards shall thine hands be strengthened to go down to the
 ‘ host.’ And after Gideon’s fears were dispelled by the dream
 and interpretation that he heard, he also encouraged his men
 by saying, ‘ Arise, for the Lord hath delivered into your hand
 ‘ the host of Midian,’ and immediately attacked the Midianites.’

H. Barnard says, she does not dispute the historic fact, but
 does not believe the divine command. Not to say a word of
 the appearance of the angel to Gideon—of the flesh and un-
 leavened cakes on the rock being consumed by the touch of the
 staff in the angel’s hand—of the fleece of wool being wet with
 the dew when it was dry on all the earth besides, and of its
 being, the following night, dry on the fleece only when there
 was dew on all the ground—of the dream with its interpreta-
 tion which Gideon heard in the camp of the Midianites; how
 are we to reconcile his conduct in attacking one hundred and
 thirty-five thousand men with only three hundred, when, if he
 had so chosen, he might have had a force equal to thirty-two
 thousand men?—Did not his conduct (if we deny his divine
 mission) exceed in rashness and folly even that of Charles
 XIIth of Sweden, who, at Bender, with three hundred
 men besides the officers of his household, fortified himself
 against the attack of an army of twenty-six thousand? The
 latter was reduced to his small number of men by misfortune,
 the former from choice. Can we suppose that H. Barnard,

who professes to believe only what appear to her *rational, consistent* opinions, does not dispute or question *in her own mind at least*, the truth of these extraordinary facts, when she openly avows her disbelief of the divine commands that are immediately connected with them, and a belief of which can alone *rationally* account for almost all the circumstances attending them?—I know of no other way to support her *consistency* than by supposing, that when she says she does not dispute these facts, or that she does not call them in question, we are not thereby to understand that she really can acknowledge her belief of them, but only that those who are sufficiently credulous to believe them, will not meet with any *direct, open* opposition from her—Such subtle distinctions, however useful or necessary they may be to those who wish to disguise the errors they are disseminating, will be rejected by the sincere seekers after truth, as rather calculated to confound and bewilder, than to enlighten the understanding.

The extract already mentioned, of what was said on this subject at one of the conferences between H. B. and the morning meeting's committee, and which is entirely omitted in the Appeal, evinces either the inaccuracy of H. Barnard's minutes of the conversations, between herself and the committee that visited her, or the unfairness of Verax's selection from them.

I cannot forbear noticing Verax's attempt to undermine the divine mission of Moses (although not directly within my plan), because his statement at first perusal appears as specious, as upon a more minute investigation it proves to be futile and void of truth. I shall give his argument unabridged. It is upon the first article of accusation.

'The terms of this charge,' he says, 'necessarily imply that the accusers profess a persuasion of the complete infallibility of the Scriptures; and therefore that the whole of them ought to be believed, especially by every minister of the gospel, "of our religious Society." But would it not have been wise, before they ventured to require an unqualified assent to so extensive an article of faith, to have informed themselves, whether the Scriptures, great as their general authenticity and value is readily acknowledged to be, do not contain some contradictory propositions? and if so, some portion of error? And whether either the Society, or its best and most generally esteemed authors, had ever considered such a requisition as a proper bond of Christian communion, or as a test of soundness in the faith, or other qualification of a true gospel minister?'

Are we not authorized to consider a belief that the Scriptures contain 'contradictory propositions,' as amounting to a

disbelief of some of the passages at least that contain such propositions? The terms of the charge certainly imply that no material errors have crept into the Scriptures, and that therefore they ought to be believed to be what they profess themselves to be. The two preceding chapters on the Scriptures exhibit the degree of importance attached to them by our early friends, to which I refer the reader; and proceed to state what is advanced by Verax, virtually, if not intentionally, against the divine mission of Moses.

‘ But to come to the particular passages which assert, “ that
 “ the Almighty commanded the Israelites to make war upon
 “ other nations.” Are all the declarations on this subject, consistent with each other, or with the general description, which
 ‘ the Scripture in numerous places gives us, of the essential and
 ‘ immutable attributes of God? Had the meeting duly considered how they could reconcile the express promises recorded
 ‘ in the 23d and 34th chapters of Exodus, respecting the
 “ Amorites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Canaanites, the
 “ Hivites, and the Jebusites, that the Almighty will cut them
 “ off.—I will drive them out before thee.—They shall not dwell
 “ in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me; for if thou
 “ serve their gods, it will surely be a snare unto thee.” And
 ‘ the equally express declarations that follow, from the third
 ‘ chapter of Judges. “ Now these are the nations which the
 “ Lord left to prove Israel by, them, to know whether they
 “ would hearken unto the commandments of the Lord, which
 “ he commanded their fathers by the hand of Moses. And
 “ the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites, the Hittites,
 “ Amorites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites. And they took
 “ their daughters to be their wives, and gave their daughters
 “ to their sons, and served their gods.” Or how these last
 ‘ texts will consist in a strict, literal sense with the following, respecting the same nations, of whom it is said, Joshua xxiv. 18.
 “ And the Lord drave out from before us (the Israelites, all the
 “ people recapitulated as above) even the Amorites that dwelt
 “ in the land.” In the 2d chapter and the 21st verse of
 ‘ Judges, it is said in the name of the Lord, “ I also will not
 “ henceforth, drive out any from before them, (the Israelites)
 “ of the nations which Joshua left when he died.” ‘ Are we
 ‘ then to believe this positive declaration; or the subsequent
 ‘ claims to divine authority, and commands for their future wars,
 ‘ to drive out these very nations? who were preserved, the next
 ‘ verse tells us, “ That through them I (the Lord) might prove
 ‘ Israel, whether they will keep the way of the Lord, to walk
 “ therein, as their fathers did keep it, or not.”*

If I were any longer to be surpris'd at any thing from the pen of Verax, it would be at his assertion, after having written the above paragraph, that a refusal 'to receive the language of Scripture in a strict, literal sense'—'constitutes the very essence of the present accusation' against H. B.—Now we read, 'And he [the Lord] said, Behold I make a covenant; before all thy people I will do marvels.—Observe thou that which I command thee this day: behold, I drive out before thee the Amorite, and the Canaanite—Take heed to thyself, lest thou make a covenant with the inhabitants,' &c.* This kind of language is represented by H. B. as '*impiously* asserting the sanction of the Almighty for these sanguinary contests,' and in this she must be allowed to be right, if, as she says, these wars were never commanded by God; but then it is equally true, that Moses asserts a falsehood in the name of the Lord; for it is absurd and only misleading the reader, to speak of 'rejecting the literal interpretation of passages' that will not admit of any other interpretation, since thereby we virtually reject the truth of such passages.—So much for this new mode of interpretation.

Let us examine whether Verax has succeeded in his attempt to prove that the Scripture expressly contradicts itself. If the reader turns back to page 163, he will there find the first text referred to in the Appeal with the addition of the context, the close of which quotation I wish him particularly to notice; the substance of it is repeated in Deuteronomy, 'And the Lord thy God will put out those nations before thee *by little and little*: thou mayst not consume them at once, lest the beasts of the field increase upon thee.'†

Thus it appears that Moses was so far from promising to the Israelites, that the Almighty would immediately drive out all the inhabitants of Canaan from before them, that he expressly informs them he would not until they were increased; and assigns a very good reason for it, that the land should not be desolated, and overrun with wild beasts.—Hence some of the Canaanites, &c. being left unsubdued at the death of Joshua, is easily reconciled with 'the express promises recorded in the 23d and 34th chapter of Exodus,' which Verax must have seen, had he impartially compared the promises with the accomplishment of them.

The Scriptures quoted in the Appeal as contradictory to the foregoing promises, are so divested of their context, that we might conclude its author had entirely forgotten his own remarks in a former part of the same work, respecting the neces-

* Exod. xxxiv. 10, 11, 12.

† Deut. vii. 22.

fity of not being misled, by the division of the Scripture into chapters and verses, from ‘ perceiving the general drift of the
 ‘ author, without a careful attention to which, we may indeed
 ‘ guess what his meaning is, but we shall be much more likely
 ‘ to stumble on one of our own, which he never thought of,
 ‘ —than to ascertain the real mind and intention of the writer.
 ‘ No book is so constantly and habitually treated in this absurd
 ‘ manner as the Bible, nor any other subject, in an equal de-
 ‘ gree, obscured and disgraced by its advocates, as that of re-
 ‘ ligion.’*

Is it not to be regretted that the conduct of Verax relative to the Scriptures, and other writings also, has not been influenced by these remarks? He not only gives an imperfect view of the promises in sacred writ, but is entirely silent respecting the judgments annexed to disobedience to the divine injunctions against idolatry, &c. The fulfilment of these judgments at this present day is no inconsiderable evidence of the divine inspiration of the books of Moses—but it is those threatenings for disobedience that relate more immediately to the æra succeeding the death of Joshua that come under our present consideration. In the Scriptures before quoted the Israelites were forbidden to make any covenant with the inhabitants of the land of Canaan, lest they should make them sin against the Lord, by serving their gods. And in Leviticus the following judgments are denounced against them in case of disobedience.

‘ But if ye will not hearken unto me, and will not do all
 ‘ these commandments—but that ye break my covenant: I also
 ‘ will do this unto you; I will even appoint over you terror,
 ‘ consumption, and the burning ague—and ye shall sow your
 ‘ seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it. And I will set my
 ‘ face against you, and ye shall be slain before your enemies:
 ‘ they that hate you shall reign over you,’ &c.†

Again in Numbers, ‘ But if ye will not drive out the inhabitants of the land from before you; then it shall come to pass,
 ‘ that those which ye let remain of them, shall be pricks in your
 ‘ eyes, and thorns in your sides, and shall vex you in the land
 ‘ wherein ye dwell.’‡

In Joshua and Judges we may trace the accomplishment of these promises upon obedience, and judgments upon disobedience, to the law delivered by Moses—When Joshua was advanced in age, he called together the elders, heads, and judges of Israel, and thus addressed them:

‘ I am old and stricken in age: and ye have seen all that

* Appeal, p. 30, 31.

† Lev. xxvi. 14 to 17.

‡ Num. xxxiii. 55.

* the Lord your God hath done unto all these nations because
 ' of you; for the Lord your God is he that hath fought for
 ' you. Behold, I have divided unto you by lot these nations that
 ' remain, to be an inheritance for your tribes, from Jordan, with
 ' all the nations that I have cut off, even unto the great sea west-
 ' ward. And the Lord your God, he shall expel them from
 ' before you, and drive them from out of your sight, and ye
 ' shall possess their land, as the Lord your God hath promised
 ' unto you. Be ye therefore very courageous to keep and to do
 ' all that is written in the book of the law of Moses, that ye
 ' turn not aside therefrom, to the right hand or to the left.—
 ' For the Lord hath driven out from before you, great nations
 ' and strong: but as for you, no man hath been able to stand
 ' before you unto this day.—Take good heed therefore unto
 ' yourselves, that ye love the Lord your God. Else if ye do in
 ' any wise go back, and cleave unto the remnant of these na-
 ' tions, even these that remain among you, and shall make mar-
 ' riages with them, and go in unto them, and they to you;
 ' know for a certainty, that the Lord your God will no more
 ' drive out any of these nations from before you, but they shall
 ' be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and
 ' thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land
 ' which the Lord your God hath given you. And behold, this
 ' day I am going the way of all the earth, and ye know in all
 ' your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath
 ' failed of all the good things which the Lord your God spake
 ' concerning you; all are come to pass unto you, and not one
 ' thing hath failed thereof, &c.*

Would Joshua in his exhortation to the elders of Israel have appealed to them, whether any of the promises delivered by Moses had failed of being fulfilled, if the remnant of the nations dwelling in another part of the land not being yet subdued by them, constituted a breach of those promises, as insinuated by Verax? From the words of Joshua we also see that the *promises* to the Israelites *were not unconditional*, their full accomplishment depending upon an unreserved obedience to the law of God, for he expressly informs them, agreeably to what had been before delivered to them by Moses, that if they make any covenant or intermarry with 'the remnant of these nations' not yet subdued, God would not drive them out from before them, but that they should be snares and traps to them.

In the next chapter Joshua enumerates to the Israelites in the name of the Lord, the superintending providence of God over them, from his calling Abraham their father unto that time,

and exhorts them to keep themselves from idolatry, and to fear and serve the Lord; to which the people answer:

*'God forbid that we should forsake the Lord to serve other gods. For the Lord our God, he it is that brought us up, and our fathers out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage; and which did those great signs in our sight, and preserved us in all the way wherein we went, and among all the people through whom we passed. And the Lord drove out from before us all the people, even the Amorites which dwelt in the land: therefore will we also serve the Lord, for he is our God.'**

The roman in the last quotation distinguishes all that is noticed by Verax.—What people were these that the Lord drove out from before the Israelites? surely all those enumerated in the twelfth chapter, and not those mentioned in the thirteenth, as yet remaining unsubdued, and who are also adverted to by Joshua in his address to the people I have just cited. Verax's criticism upon the part selected can only rest upon the Israelites distinguishing 'the remnant of these nations' not yet subdued, by the same names with those that were driven out. This verbal criticism may suit those who are 'desirous of undermining the authority of revealed religion, and studious in exposing every little difficulty attending the Scriptures, to popular animadversion and contempt,' but must meet with its deserved reprehension from every sincere advocate of genuine Christianity.

In the book of Judges we read—'And it came to pass when Israel was strong, that they put the Canaanites to tribute, and did not utterly drive them out.'† And after giving the names of those that were put to tribute, it proceeds thus; 'And an angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you unto the land which I swore unto your fathers; and I said, I will never break my covenant with you. And ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land, you shall throw down their altars: but ye have not obeyed my voice; Why have ye done this? Wherefore I also said, I will not drive them out from before you: but they shall be as thorns in your sides, and their gods shall be a snare unto you.' Although this severe rebuke made some impression on the people, it does not appear to have been lasting, for a few verses further on it says,—'And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and served Baalim; and they forsook the Lord God of their fathers—and followed other gods;‡ we are not therefore to be surprised at reading,—'And the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he said, Because that this people hath transgressed

* Josh. xxiv. 16, to 18.

† Judg. i. 28.

‡ Judg. ii. 1, 2, 3. 11, 12.

' my covenant which I commanded their fathers, and have not heark-
 ' ened unto my voice : I also will not henceforth drive out any
 ' from before them, of the nations which Joshua left when he
 ' died : that through them I may prove Israel, whether they will
 ' keep the way of the Lord, to walk therein, as their fathers did keep
 ' it, or not. Therefore the Lord left those nations without driving
 ' them out hastily, neither delivered he them into the hand of Joshua.
 ' Now these are the nations which the Lord left to prove Israel
 ' by them,—namely, five lords of the Philistines, and all the
 ' Canaanites, and the Sidonians, and the Hivites that dwelt in Mount
 ' Lebanon, from Mount Baal-hermon, unto the entering in of Ha-
 ' math. And they were to prove Israel by them, to know whether
 ' they would hearken unto the commandments of the Lord,
 ' which he commanded their fathers by the hand of Moses.—
 ' And the children of Israel dwelt among the Canaanites,
 ' Hittites, and Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and Je-
 ' busites : and they took their daughters to be their wives, and
 ' gave their daughters to their sons, and served their gods.
 ' And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord, and
 ' forgot the Lord their God, and served Baalim and the groves.
 ' Therefore the anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he
 ' sold them into the hand of Chusban-rishathaim king of Meso-
 ' potamia, and the children of Israel served Chusban-rishathaim eight
 ' years. And when the children of Israel cried unto the Lord, the
 ' Lord raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, who delivered
 ' them, even Othniel the son of Kenaz, Caleb's younger brother.*

The roman in this last extract distinguishes as before what is
 quoted by Verax in detached parts without any attention to
 the context.—I have been the more copious in my quotations
 from Scripture, that the harmony between the prophecies and
 their fulfilment might be more clearly seen. The Almighty
 was with the Jews, under Joshua, and after his death whilst
 they were obedient to the law of Moses, so that their enemies
 could not stand before them ; but when they rebelled against
 the Lord, by intermarrying with the neighbouring idolatrous
 nations, they were forsaken of God, they fled from before their
 enemies, and became tributary to them. When on account of their
 sins they were subjugated by Jabin king of Canaan, they were
 so oppressed by him, that ' the highways were unoccupied, and
 ' the travellers walked through by-ways,' and the villages were
 deserted, for they could not even go to the wells to draw water
 without being in danger from the archers. And when after-
 wards from the same cause they were delivered into the hand of
 Midian, their situation seems to have been even worse than

* Judges ii, 20 to 23. iii. 1 to 9.

under Jabin, for they were obliged to conceal themselves in dens, mountains, caves, and strong holds, and the increase of the earth was destroyed by the Midianites, who 'left no sustenance for Israel, neither sheep, nor ox, nor ass,' so that whatever corn they had, was by stealth, as may be seen in the case of Gideon. All this was no more than what Moses had foretold would befall them, if they transgressed his laws—see the extract from Leviticus in page 172, which says, 'I will appoint over you terror, consumption, &c. and ye shall sow your seed in vain, for your enemies shall eat it, and I will set my face against you, and ye shall be slain before your enemies.' But whenever through the weight of their oppressions they were brought to a sense of their sins, and cried to the Lord for help, he heard their cry and wrought their deliverance; and this was sometimes attended with circumstances so singular and contrary to all human probability, that they could not but perceive, their success was not of themselves, but of the Lord.

Well therefore might the Israelites from the promises and curses contained in the law, and their own experience of their exact fulfilment, attribute whatever befel them, not to chance, but to the superintending power of God, who would not suffer his laws and statutes to be trampled on with impunity. But hence it does not follow, that the conduct of their judges, when they did not act from an immediate divine command, (as Gideon evidently did) must in every instance meet with our approbation; for *abstractedly* considered, it will be difficult to justify the manner in which Ehud killed Eglon king of Moab, and that in which Jael killed Sisera, also the marriage of Samson with a daughter of the Philistines;—although their conduct was made instrumental to the annoyance of the enemies of Israel: the latter was an act expressly contrary to the law of Moses, which prohibited all intermarriages with other nations. By not distinguishing actions of this kind from those that originated in an immediate command from God, we confound things that require a distinct consideration; although the Supreme Being made each subservient to his gracious designs towards his people.

Upon the Scripture passage which says, 'I (the Lord) will not henceforth drive out any from before them (the Israelites,) of the nations which Joshua left when he died?' Verax enquires, 'Are we to believe this positive declaration, or the subsequent claims to divine authority, and commands for their future wars, to drive out these very nations?'

We read of 'subsequent claims to divine authority' for delivering the Israelites from their oppressions under these nations, but we may search in vain for such claims to drive them out;

Saul indeed received a divine commission from Samuel to destroy utterly the Amalekites, but then it was to fulfil a denunciation pronounced against them in Exodus—‘ I’ (the Lord) ‘ will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from ‘ under heaven—The Lord hath sworn that the Lord will have ‘ war with Amalek from generation to generation.’* Although Verax has sufficiently evinced his disbelief in the divine mission for destroying the Amalekites, he must acknowledge that what is recorded respecting them in Exodus and the 1st book of Samuel, are in perfect agreement with each other.

Verax asks, ‘ Are all the declarations on this subject [the Jewish wars] ‘ consistent with each other, or with the general ‘ description which the Scripture, in numerous places, gives us, ‘ of the essential and immutable attributes of God?’

The perfect harmony of these declarations with each other has been already shown; with respect to the latter part of the objection, it is, setting aside the appeal to Scripture, the same as that of T. Paine and other Deists, who deny, with H. Barnard, that ‘ the great and merciful Creator ever commissioned’ the Jews to make war upon the Canaanites—This objection, founded upon the supposed inconsistency of a divine sanction of these wars with the mercy and moral justice of God, has met with so full and decisive an answer from Watson in his *Apology for the Bible*, that I shall repeat it: the importance of the subject will apologize for its length.

‘ You [Thomas Paine] hold it impossible that the Bible can ‘ be the word of God, because it is therein said, that the ‘ Israelites destroyed the Canaanites by the express command ‘ of God; and to believe the Bible to be true, we must, you ‘ affirm, unbelieve all our belief of the moral justice of God; ‘ for wherein, you ask, could crying or smiling infants offend? ‘ I am astonished that so acute a reasoner should attempt to ‘ disparage the Bible, by bringing forward this exploded and ‘ frequently confuted objection of Morgan, Tindal, and Boling- ‘ broke. You profess yourself to be a Deist, and to believe that ‘ there is a God, who created the universe, and established the ‘ laws of nature, by which it is sustained in existence. You ‘ profess that from the contemplation of the works of God, you ‘ derive a knowledge of his attributes; and you reject the ‘ Bible, because it ascribes to God things inconsistent (as you ‘ suppose) with the attributes which you have discovered to be- ‘ long to him; in particular, you think it repugnant to his moral ‘ justice, that he should doom to destruction the crying or ‘ smiling infants of the Canaanites. Why do you not main- ‘ tain it to be repugnant to his moral justice, that he should

' suffer crying or smiling infants to be swallowed up by an
 ' earthquake, drowned by an inundation, consumed by a fire,
 ' starved by a famine, or destroyed by a pestilence? The Word
 ' of God is in perfect harmony with his work; crying or
 ' smiling infants are subjected to death in both. We believe
 ' that the earth, at the express command of God, opened her
 ' mouth, and swallowed up Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, with
 ' their wives, their sons, and their little ones. This you esteem
 ' so repugnant to God's moral justice, that you spurn, as spu-
 ' rious, the book in which the circumstance is related. When
 ' Catania, Lima, and Lisbon, were severally destroyed by earth-
 ' quakes, men with their wives, their sons, and their little ones,
 ' were swallowed up alive—why do you not spurn, as spurious,
 ' the book of nature, in which this fact is certainly written,
 ' and from the perusal of which you infer the moral justice of
 ' God? You will, probably, reply, that the evils which the
 ' Canaanites suffered from the express command of God, were
 ' different from those which are brought on mankind by the
 ' operation of the laws of nature.—Different! in what?—Not
 ' in the magnitude of the evil—not in the subjects of sufferance—
 ' not in the author of it—for my philosophy, at least, instructs
 ' me to believe, that God not only primarily formed, but that
 ' he hath through all ages, executed the laws of nature, and
 ' that he will, through all eternity, administer them for the
 ' general happiness of his creatures, whether we can, on every
 ' occasion, discern that end or not.'

' I am far from being guilty of the impiety of questioning the
 ' existence of the moral justice of God, as proved either by na-
 ' tural or revealed religion; what I contend for is shortly this—
 ' that you have no right, in fairness of reasoning, to urge any
 ' apparent deviation from moral justice as an argument against
 ' revealed religion, because you do not urge an equally apparent
 ' deviation from it, as an argument against natural religion; you
 ' reject the former, and admit the latter, without considering
 ' that, as to your objection, they must stand or fall together.'

' As to the Canaanites, it is needless to enter into any proof
 ' of the depraved state of their morals; they were a wicked
 ' people in the time of Abraham, and they, even then, were de-
 ' voted to destruction by God; but their iniquity was not then
 ' full. In the time of Moses, they were idolaters, sacrificers of
 ' their own *crying or smiling infants*; devourers of human
 ' flesh; addicted to unnatural lust; immersed in the filthiness
 ' of all manner of vice. Now, I think, it will be impossible to
 ' prove, that it was a proceeding contrary to God's moral justice
 ' to exterminate so wicked a people. He made the Israelites
 ' the executors of his vengeance; and in doing this, he gave
 ' such an evident and terrible proof of his abomination of vice,

‘as could not fail to strike the surrounding nations with
 ‘astonishment and terror, and to impress on the minds of the
 ‘Israelites what they were to expect, if they followed the ex-
 ‘ample of the nations whom he commanded them to cut off.
 ‘Ye shall not commit these abominations—that the land spue
 ‘not you out also, as it spued out the nations that were before
 ‘you.” How strong and descriptive this language! the vices
 ‘of the inhabitants were so abominable, that the very land was
 ‘sick of them, and forced to vomit them forth, as the stomach
 ‘disgorges a deadly poison.’

‘I have often wondered what could be the reason that men,
 ‘not destitute of talents, should be desirous of undermining the
 ‘authority of revealed religion, and studious in exposing, with
 ‘a malignant and illiberal exultation, every little difficulty at-
 ‘tending the Scriptures, to popular animadversion and con-
 ‘tempt. I am not willing to attribute this strange propensity
 ‘to what Plato attributed the atheism of his time—to proflig-
 ‘gacy of manners—to affectation of singularity—to gross igno-
 ‘rance, assuming the semblance of deep research and superior
 ‘sagacity.—I had rather refer it to an impropriety of judgment,
 ‘respecting the manners, and mental acquirements of human
 ‘kind in the first ages of the world. Most unbelievers argue
 ‘as if they thought that man, in remote and rude antiquity, in
 ‘the very birth and infancy of our species, had the same distinct
 ‘conceptions of one, eternal, invisible, incorporeal, infinitely
 ‘wise, powerful, and good God, which they themselves have
 ‘now. This I look upon as a great mistake, and a pregnant
 ‘source of infidelity.—The history of man is the history of the
 ‘providence of God; who, willing the supreme felicity of all
 ‘his creatures, has adapted his government to the capacity of
 ‘those, who in different ages were the subjects of it. The his-
 ‘tory of one nation throughout all ages, and that of all nations
 ‘in the same age, are but separate parts of one great plan,
 ‘which God is carrying on for the moral melioration of man-
 ‘kind. But who can comprehend the whole of this immense
 ‘design? The shortness of life, the weakness of our faculties,
 ‘the inadequacy of our means of information, conspire to make
 ‘it impossible for us, worms of the earth! insects of an hour!
 ‘completely to understand any one of its parts. No man, who
 ‘well weighs the subject, ought to be surprised, that in the
 ‘histories of ancient times many things should occur foreign to
 ‘our manners, the propriety and necessity of which we cannot
 ‘clearly comprehend.’

‘It appears incredible to many, that God Almighty should
 ‘have had colloquial intercourse with our first parents, that he
 ‘should have contracted a kind of friendship for the patriarchs,
 ‘and entered into covenants with them; that he should have suf-

' pended the laws of nature in Egypt; should have been so appa-
 ' rently partial as to become the God and governor of one parti-
 ' cular nation; and should have so far demeaned himself as to give
 ' that people a burthenfome ritual of worship, statutes, and ordi-
 ' nances, many of which seem to be beneath the dignity of his
 ' attention, unimportant and impolitic. I have conversed with
 ' many deists, and have always found that the strangeness of these
 ' things was the only reason for their disbelief of them: nothing
 ' similar has happened in their time; they will not, therefore,
 ' admit that these events have really taken place at any time.
 ' As well might a child, when arrived at the state of manhood,
 ' contend that he had never either stood in need of or experi-
 ' enced the fostering care of a mother's kindness, the wearisome
 ' attention of his nurse, or the instruction and discipline of his
 ' schoolmaster. The Supreme Being selected one family from
 ' an idolatrous world; nursed it up, by various acts of his pro-
 ' vidence, into a great nation; communicated to that nation a
 ' knowledge of his holiness, justice, mercy, power, and wisdom;
 ' disseminated them, at various times, through every part of the
 ' earth, that they might be a "leaven to leaven the whole lump,"
 ' that they might assure all other nations of the existence of one
 ' supreme God, the creator and preserver of the world, the only
 ' proper object of adoration. With what reason can we expect,
 ' that what was done to one nation, not out of any partiality to
 ' them, but for the general good, should be done to all? that
 ' the mode of instruction, which was suited to the infancy of
 ' the world, should be extended to the maturity of its manhood,
 ' or to the imbecility of its old age? I own to you, that when
 ' I consider how nearly man, in a savage state, approaches to
 ' the brute creation, as to intellectual excellence; and when I
 ' contemplate his miserable attainments as to the knowledge of
 ' God, in a civilized state, when he has had no divine instruc-
 ' tion on the subject, or when that instruction has been forgot-
 ' ten, (for all men have known something of God by tradition), I
 ' cannot but admire the wisdom and goodness of the Supreme
 ' Being, in having let himself down to our apprehensions; in
 ' having given to mankind, in the earliest ages, sensible and ex-
 ' traordinary proofs of his existence and attributes; in having
 ' made the Jewish and Christian dispensations mediums to con-
 ' vey to all men, through all ages, that knowledge concerning
 ' himself, which he had vouchsafed to give immediately to the
 ' first; I own it is strange, very strange, that he should have
 ' made an immediate manifestation of himself in the first ages
 ' of the world; but what is there that is not strange? It is
 ' strange that you and I are here—that there is water, and earth,
 ' and air, and fire—that there is a sun, and moon, and stars—
 ' that there is generation, corruption, reproduction. I can

‘ account ultimately for none of these things, without recurring to him who made every thing. I also am his workmanship, and look up to him with hope of preservation through all eternity; I adore him for his word as well as for his work, his work I cannot comprehend, but his word hath assured me of all that I am concerned to know—that he hath prepared everlasting happiness for those who love and obey him. This you will call preachment:—I will have done with it, but the subject is so vast, and the plan of providence, in my opinion, so obviously wise and good, that I can never think of it without my mind being filled with piety, admiration, and gratitude.’*

It is to be hoped these observations will counteract any injurious impressions, some of the readers of the ‘Appeal’ may have received. For notwithstanding its author professes a sort of inconsistent belief in the divine authority of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, his arguments are calculated to lead his readers to the same point, as those advanced by T. Paine, and therefore require the same answer.

Verax may, perhaps, endeavour to repel the charge of inconsistency, by representing his sentiments with respect to the Scripture, as amounting to no more than an allegorical or metaphorical interpretation of passages that have been erroneously understood in a literal sense. It will be readily admitted that the Scriptures are sometimes to be understood in an allegoric or metaphoric sense; but Verax apprehends he finds contradictions and mistakes in the Old Testament; now what is in itself false and contradictory, can never be made true, either by allegory or metaphor; for example, we read, ‘And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Vex the Midianites, and smite them; for they vex you with their wives, wherewith they have beguiled you, in the matter of Peor,’ &c.† This command is afterwards repeated, ‘And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites: afterward shalt thou be gathered unto thy people.’‡ If H. Barnard and her advocate assert no such command was given, will any allegory or metaphor avail to reconcile their assertion with the preceding passages? If we are to judge on which side the truth is, by the event as recorded in Scripture, the decision must be in favour of the reality of the command; the divine interposition in favour of the Israelites was so striking, that Watson makes the following remarks on it:

‘The Israelitish army consisted but of twelve thousand men, a mere handful when opposed to the people of Midian; yet, when the officers made a muster of their troops after their

* Watson’s *Apology for the Bible*, 8th Edit. p. 15—29.

† Numb. xxv. 17, 18.

‡ Ibid. xxxi. 1, 2.

‘ return from the war, they found that they had not lost a single
 ‘ man ! This circumstance struck them as so decisive an evi-
 ‘ dence of God’s interposition, that out of the spoils they had
 ‘ taken, they offered “ an oblation to the Lord, an atonement
 ‘ for their souls.” ‘ Do but believe what the captains of thou-
 ‘ sands, and the captains of hundreds, believed at the time when
 ‘ these things happened, and we shall never more hear of your
 ‘ (T. Paine’s) objections to the Bible, from its account of the
 ‘ wars of Moses.’*

What were Paine’s objections to the Bible ? That it ascribes
 ‘ the wickedness of man to the orders of the Almighty.’ And
 that Moses was the first that ‘ began and carried on wars
 ‘ on the score, or on the pretence, of religion.’ There is one
 thing respecting which Watson and Paine appear to agree,
 namely, that the truth of the Bible must stand or fall in our
 view, as we receive or reject the divine sanction for the Jewish
 wars. H. B. by rejecting this divine sanction, cannot therefore,
 according to their united testimony, believe the Bible to be true,
 without being inconsistent with herself.

* Watson’s Apology. p. 85, 86.

CHAP. VIII.

A continuation of the same subject—On the Divine commands for the wars of the Jews—On the Divine command to ABRAHAM to offer up his son ISAAC.

‘IT does not appear,’ says Verax, ‘that our early friends reflected much upon the consistency or inconsistency of ascribing to the universal Parent of mankind, an approbation of, and positive commands to wage war in former ages of the world. It mostly satisfied them, to inculcate its utter repugnance to the spirit and precepts of Christianity.’*

Our early friends appear to have been not *mostly* but *entirely* satisfied with inculcating the utter repugnance of war to the spirit and precepts of Christianity. So far were they from seeing ‘the inconsistency of ascribing to the universal Parent of mankind an approbation of, and positive commands to wage war,’ as recorded in the Scriptures, that they have always acknowledged, when occasion required it, the divine origin of the law of Moses, in which those commands are inserted; for they believed ‘that it hath pleased God, in order to man’s recovery from that grievous lapse, disobedience hath cast him into, at sundry times, and in *divers manners*, to appear to the sons of men,—and that these manifestations have had something peculiar to them, and very remarkable in them, so that *they claim a place in our creed*.—The first was that of the prophets, in which Moses preceded, by whom the law came to the Jews, but grace and truth to mankind by Jesus Christ.’—That ‘the one did forerun the

‘other, as in order of time, so in *nature* of dispensation : the law was the *gospel begun*, the gospel was the *law fulfilled* or ‘finished; they cannot be parted.’* Hence they considered a belief in one necessarily connected with a belief in the other, and if they have not frequently recurred to the subject of the wars of the Jews, it was because they being ‘peculiar to their ‘political, typical, and mutable state,’ the gospel is unconcerned in them, as being ended by the bringing in of a more perfect dispensation, and not because our early friends considered them inconsistent with a dispensation the *nature* of which was different from that of the gospel, ‘for the law made nothing perfect, but ‘the bringing in of a better hope did, by which we draw nigh ‘unto God.’†

The inseparable connexion between the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament appeared to them so obvious, that they generally include both when expressing their belief in their divine origin : thus W. Penn in a letter to the king of Poland, says, ‘We believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to ‘have been given forth by divine inspiration; and they are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, &c.‡ And in his *Advice to his Children*—‘They, [the Scriptures of the Old and New ‘Testament] were given forth by holy men of God, in divers ‘ages, as they were moved of the Holy Spirit; and are the declared and revealed mind and will of God to mankind under ‘divers dispensations, and they are certainly able to make the ‘man of God perfect, through faith unto salvation.’||

But as Verax has manifested no partiality for general expressions that acknowledge a belief of the divine authority of the *whole* of the Scriptures, as not being sufficiently definite to embrace the *parts* of which that whole is composed, I shall, without questioning the reasonableness of his requisitions, supply him with the sentiments of our early friends on ‘the positive commands to wage war’ recorded in the Old Testament, the truth of this particular part of the Scriptures, being rejected by him.—The following is from *Some Considerations propounded to the Jews* by Isaac Penington.

‘Consideration I. *What great love, mercy, and kindness, God ‘showed to that people, above all nations and people under heaven!* ‘Of his own free love he set his heart upon them, choosing them ‘to be a people to himself. He brought them out of Egypt, ‘by a mighty hand and outstretched arm; he mightily preserved them in, and led them through, the wilderness. He ‘entered into a covenant with them to become their God.—He ‘gave them righteous laws, judgments, statutes, and ordi-

* Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 753.

‡ Penn’s Works, Vol. I. p. 56.

† Heb. vii. 19.

|| Ibid. p. 896.

nances, both of worship towards him, and of an upright demeanour and conversation among themselves, and towards all men. *He drove out the heathen from before them*, and gave them a pleasant land to possess,—a land flowing with milk and honey. He built an habitation for himself among them; first, a moving sanctuary or tabernacle, afterwards a more settled abiding place or temple (which Solomon built) wherein was the ark of his presence, where he was to be sought unto and enquired of by them, and towards which their prayers were to be directed.—He sent prophets among them, to reprove their errors and backslidings, and to set them to rights again. *He raised up judges likewise to defend them*; and although they were weary of his government, desiring a king after the manner of the nations so vehemently, that they even forced a king from him, yet he took him away from them, and after him chose a man after his own heart, to feed Jacob his people, and Israel his inheritance,* &c.*

In *Some Questions and Answers for the opening of the Eyes of the Jew natural*, I. Penington says,

‘Quest. How did God try them [the Jews] in the wilderness?’

‘Ans. By many temptations, signs, and wonders: *by powerful appearances for them against their enemies*; by bringing them into many straits; by unexpected and impossible supplies (I mean impossible to the sight or expectation of the outward eye); as with bread from heaven, multitudes of quails, water from the rock, keeping their clothes and shoes from wearing out and decaying. Likewise he gave them an holy and righteous law to inform their minds in equity and righteousness—and this law was delivered in great majesty, dread, and terror, to cause a deep impression thereof upon their minds.’

‘Quest. How did God find them in the wilderness?’

‘Ans. Full of discontent, full of murmuring, full of self-will, full of doubts and questionings concerning God’s power. They did not wait on him, who had delivered them out of the hand of Pharaoh—but they murmured against him. They did not wait for food or water when they wanted, but distrusted and complained.—Neither were they content with the provision which God allotted them,—but they would have flesh.—Again, *They would not go on towards Canaan, or fight when God would have them, and when his strength would have gone with them*; but when he forbade them, of their own will, and trusting to their own strength, they would go on and fight.’—

‘Quest. How did God deal with them in reference to the land of Canaan?’

* Penington’s Works, Vol. I, p. 328, 389.

‘ Ans. First, He prepared them for it. Secondly, *He dis-
‘ possessed their enemies, and placed them in it*, giving them an in-
‘ heritance according to their own will. Thirdly, He poured
‘ down blessings upon them therein.’*

Again, in a piece entitled, *To the Jews Natural, &c.* ‘ The
‘ eternal God was thy refuge, and underneath were the ever-
‘ lasting arms (the Lord was thy rock, and thou wast built upon
‘ him); and *he did thrust out the enemy before thee, and did say,*
‘ *Destroy.* And when the arm of the Lord did destroy them
‘ before thee, thou didst dwell in safety alone.—Happy wast
‘ thou, O Israel! who was like unto thee, O people saved by
‘ the Lord! the shield of thy help, and who was the sword of
‘ thy excellency! and thine enemies were found liars unto
‘ thee, and thou didst tread upon their high places.’†

These extracts are sufficient evidence to prove Isaac Penington’s firm belief of the divine origin of the law of Moses, of the miraculous interpositions of the Almighty on behalf of the Israelites, and of the divine commands for their wars with the inhabitants of Canaan.

Thomas Ellwood in his preface to his Sacred History remarks, ‘ What Cicero saith of history in general, namely, that
‘ it is, “ *Temporum testis, lux veritatis, vita memoria, magistra
‘ vite, & nuncia antiquitatis;*” i. e. “ The witness of times, the
‘ light of truth, the life of memory, the mistress of life, and the
‘ messenger of antiquity,” cannot be so well verified of any
‘ particular history, as of that which being written by divinely
‘ inspired penmen, is contained in the books of the Old and
‘ New Testament.—Of the matter nothing need be said,—to add
‘ to the excellency or credit thereof,’ &c.‡ And I may add,
that nothing that Verax has said will injure its credit.

After mentioning the murmuring of the Israelites in consequence of the evil report of the spies, and God’s having threatened to cut them off for their rebellion against him, Thomas Ellwood adds—‘ But though God, at the instant intreaty of
‘ Moses, did reverse his sentence of present death upon the
‘ whole congregation of murmurers, yet the ten false spies, the
‘ immediate authors of this rebellion, who had brought up an
‘ evil report upon the good land, were punished with death at
‘ that time; for they died by the plague before the Lord. But
‘ Caleb and Joshua (who were men of a right spirit, and fulfilled
‘ the will of the Lord) they were preserved alive, were com-
‘ mended of God, and had his promise, that they should enter
‘ into and possess the good land.’§

* Penington, Vol. I. p. 503.

† Ibid. Vol. II. p. 274.

‡ Ellwoods Sacred History, 8vo Edit. 1778. Vol. I. p. iii,

§ Ibid. p. 250.

And upon the expedition of the Israelites against Midian, Ellwood says, ‘ Moses gave order that a detachment of twelve thousand select men should go against the Midianites—This was a very little host to invade a great and potent people: but the Lord who sent them, went with them, to whom to prevail by many or by few is alike.’ And upon their return from the expedition, ‘ But that all this execution should be done without the loss of one man on Israel’s side (for so the officers upon a muster made report) may well pass for a miracle, and be numbered amongst the battles of the Lord.’*

Thomas Ellwood, indeed, in his Sacred History, not only uniformly adopts the inspired penmen’s accounts of the origin of the Jewish wars, but frequently, as in the present case, confirms them by his own reflections.

Our early Friends were as faithful in supporting their testimony against all wars and fightings under the Christian dispensation as we of the present day; may we not therefore conclude that, if they had thought the sentiments of Penington and Ellwood with regard to the Jewish wars, incompatible with their stations in the church, they would have suppressed rather than have countenanced them by repeated editions of their works? but that they could not have done without contradicting their professed belief in the divine authority of the sacred writings.

An extract is given, in the *Appeal*, from Robert Barclay, as favouring H. B.’s views of the subject under consideration, it is totally inapplicable, but as the sense of Barclay is perverted, it will be proper to notice it. It is in his Epistle to the Ambassadors at Nimeguen, the italic distinguishes what is omitted in the *Appeal*—After describing the frivolous grounds upon which wars are undertaken, he proceeds:—

‘ Yea, is it not so, that there is only a name, and nothing of the true nature of Christians manifest in the clergy, who pretend not only to be professors, but preachers, promoters, and exhorters of others to Christianity, who for the most part are the greatest promoters and advancers of those wars; and by whom upon all such occasions the name of God and Jesus Christ is—profaned and blasphemed, while they dare pray to God, and thank him for the destruction of their brethren Christians, and that for and against, according to the changeable wills of their several princes: yea so, that some will join in their prayers with and for the prosperity of such as their profession obliges them to believe to be heretical and antichristian; and for the destruction of those, whom the same profession acknowledges to be good

‘and orthodox Christians—Yea, which is yet more strange, if either
 ‘constraint or interest do engage any prince or state to change his party,
 ‘while the same war and cause remains; then will the clergy pre-
 ‘sently accommodate their prayers to the case, in praying for prosperity
 ‘to those, to whom instantly before they wished ruin; and so on the
 ‘contrary:—as in this present war, in the case of the Bishop of
 ‘Munster is manifest. Was there ever, or can there be any
 ‘more horrible profanation of the holy and pure name of God,
 ‘especially to be done by those, who pretend to be worshippers
 ‘of the true God, and disciples of Jesus Christ? This not only
 ‘equals, but far exceeds the wickedness of the heathens; for
 ‘they only prayed such gods to their assistance, as they fancied
 ‘allowed their ambition, and accounted their warring a virtue;
 ‘whom they judged changeable like themselves, and subject to
 ‘such quarrels among themselves, as they that are their wor-
 ‘shippers: but for those to be found in these things, who be-
 ‘lieve there is but one only God, and have, or at least profess to
 ‘have such notions of his justice, equity, and mercy, and of the
 ‘certainty of his punishing the transgressors of his law, is so
 ‘horrible and abominable, as cannot sufficiently be neither said
 ‘nor written.’*

To supply the want of the part he has omitted, Verax adds after the words *holy and pure name of God* ‘(than the practice of
 ‘war),’ Barclay no doubt thought war contrary to the Christian dispensation, and in this Epistle complains of Christian princes making war upon every slender pretext, ‘such as their
 ‘small discontents,’ or to gratify ‘their grandeur and worldly
 ‘glory’ as inconsistent with professing ‘to be followers of the
 ‘lamb-like Jesus, who came not to destroy men’s lives, but to
 ‘save them: the song of whose appearance to the world was,
 “Glory to God in the highest, and good-will and peace to all
 “men.” But the severe censure of Barclay quoted in the Ap-
 peal is confined to the conduct of those pretended preachers of
 the gospel who ‘dare pray to God for the destruction of their
 ‘Christian brethren,’ and ‘presently accommodate their prayers’
 to the changeable partial interests of the prince under whom
 they live, ‘in praying for prosperity to those to whom instantly
 ‘before they wished ruin.’

Verax might well suppose it would ‘be said that Robert
 ‘Barclay has not here adverted to any of the texts in the Old
 ‘Testament, which assert a divine command for war;’ for what
 he has said is so foreign to them, that had not Verax misrepresented and perverted his meaning, he would probably have
 found the Epistle but ill suited to his purpose.

* Barclay’s Works p. 708, 709.

The manner in which he has treated this passage of Robert Barclay's affords a very striking instance of insincerity: I advert to what is represented in the *Appeal* as having passed between the Respondents of the Quarterly Meeting of London and Middlesex and Hannah Barnard, before the Committee of Appeals appointed by the Yearly Meeting.* It says that H. B. read before the Committee her 'defence in writing, on the subject of war' 'containing large quotations from the writings of 'Friends,' but gives no copy of the defence, although it was a material document to qualify the reader to judge of the propriety and relevance of the respondents' reply, it is from their remarks alone, as given by H. B. that we can form any idea of its purport, and from them it seems it contained the extract from Barclay's letter to the Ambassadors at Nimeguen as given in the *Appeal*, p. 76, and noticed above—the remarks of J. G. Bevan, one of the respondents upon this written defence, are described by H. B. nearly as follows :

'J. G. Bevan then undertook to reconcile the alleged contradictions in the Scripture accounts of the Jewish wars, referred to in my written defence. All which he made light of; saying, That was the way with deists and infidels; to begin their attack on the Bible, by labouring to find contradictions in it, evidently in order to overthrow the whole; that it was a very pleasing employment to them, for if that could be once effected, the point they aimed at would be fully gained—he had this further to remark, that if any person could find inconsistencies in the passages quoted, when fairly viewed in connexion with their several contexts, he thought they must be very ready in finding contradictions. He also alleged, that the quotation from Robert Barclay's letter to the Ambassadors at Nimeguen was not intended to reprobate war, but only to expose the duplicity of priests, who, for the sake of worldly favour and gain, would applaud and pray for every party in their turn: declaring it a false quotation, at least, that its application was false; entreating me to see it; saying he believed I had not examined it, before I brought it forward, for if I had, he was persuaded, I must have seen it was no thing to the purpose,' &c.†

Whether this speech of J. B. Bevan is correctly stated by H. B. or not, if her paper contained the same attacks upon the divine authority of the Old Testament that are contained in the second part of the *Appeal*, and to which I have replied, they were sufficiently similar to those of the Deists to justify his remarks, although not sufficient to denominate H. B. a Deist;

* The same Committee that is adverted to in the letter to John Evans, page 21 of this work.

† *Appeal*, p. 159.

neither are we to suppose he intended it, but only to impress the Committee with the tendency of her arguments. The justness of his observations on Barclay's letter, I think, has been already proved. In the next sitting of the Committee H. B. represents herself as giving the following answer on that subject.

" I adverted to J. G. Bevan's assertion, respecting the quotation from Robert Barclay's letter to the Ambassadors at Nimeguen, that it had no reference to war, or was not intended to reprobate it as an evil; that after considering it further, I was still of the same mind as before, and considered it as relevant to my point. He said he did not say that no part of the letter was against war, but only that the part I had quoted, related entirely to another subject. In order to elucidate the matter to every reader of these minutes, I here insert the quotation, with the manner and design of its introduction." ' For which see Part 2, page 76,'* says Verax, avoiding to give the quotation with its context upon which the argument depended, by referring the reader to a place where he must have known that the manner and design of its introduction is wholly suppressed.

The suppression of H. B.'s written defence, and the omission of the design of the extract from Barclay, when professing to give it, manifest a bias that disqualifies for a faithful, dispassionate representation of private conferences, for the truth of which the public must depend upon the narrator, as it has not the means to detect an unfair statement. Barclay's belief of the divine authority and inspiration of the Old Testament, and which necessarily includes the commands for the Jewish wars, has been already too amply adduced to render a repetition necessary.

Verax has endeavoured to supply his deficiency of testimonies, from our early friends, to support H. B.'s scepticism as to the divine mission of Moses, by some extracts from a friend of more modern date, namely Anthony Benezet, a writer held ' in very general estimation, as a religious and philanthropic character,' who employed his pen ' in the *compilation* of books, ' and other writings for profitable instruction, on religious subjects,' but these being ' chiefly extracted from *various authors* of eminence' do not appear to have undergone that particular examination of the Society, which books more directly relating to doctrinal subjects, and not compiled from other authors, are either subjected to, or the Society of Friends not implicated in the sentiments they contain. I do not mention this from an idea that the extracts adduced from this author require any particular apology, or contain any thing contrary to the

* Appeal, p. 163.

doctrines of the Society, of which he was a truly valuable member; but to prevent the public being misled by supposing from what Verax has said on this subject, that the Society of Friends is responsible for miscellaneous publications, chiefly extracted from authors; because they may have been compiled and written by one of its members, the tenor and spirit of whose writings are generally approved. Verax has, therefore, first to show that the particular work of A. Benezet's, from which his extracts are taken, underwent an examination on behalf of the Society, before they can prove any thing; and even then, the silence of A. Benezet on the divine commands to Moses (now first called in question by any assuming the name of Quakers or Friends), because not immediately connected with his subject, clears the Society in Philadelphia from the inconsequent deductions drawn in the Appeal from his words. But allowing Verax all he asks, what can he prove by it? not that our early friends, whic his the point in debate, were, not that the Society at large even of the present day are of H. B.'s opinions, but only that the Monthly Meeting of Philadelphia has in one instance, which I can by no means believe, swerved from the faith of their forefathers, and that probably more from inadvertence than design. But waving these considerations, let us examine whether the extracts from A. Benezet will authorize the deductions made from them by Verax.

Anthony Benezet, relates of some Indians, that they 'absolutely refused to be concerned in war of any kind, being persuaded, that, in the original creation of man, God did not intend they should annoy or kill, but cherish and comfort each other.'*

That God did not intend in the original creation of man, that they should annoy or kill each other, will be readily granted, neither did he intend men should lose their lives by famine, pestilence, or earthquake, any more than by the sword, the cause which introduced one, introduced the other, namely, the FALL. Adam was created in the image of God, but by sin and disobedience fell from it, became dead unto God and holiness, and his offspring are all fallen with him, for he begat his children in his own image and likeness, who are therefore subject to calamities, diseases, and death, and what is far worse, to the conflicting passions of their corrupt fallen nature. It is yielding to these passions, and resisting the principle of divine grace, that have brought down the judgments of the Lord upon the earth.—The wickedness of mankind was the cause of Noah's flood.—The abominations of

* The Plainness and Innocent Simplicity of the Christian Religion, &c. p. 6. By Anthony Benezet.

Sodom and Gomorrah brought fire from heaven that consumed all their inhabitants—the like causes brought the judgments of God upon the Canaanites, in the execution of which the Israelites were his chosen and appointed instruments.

Anthony Benezet describes the deplorable spectacle, a field of battle exhibits after action, and observing, that it is, ‘to say nothing of Christianity, a scene contrary to every idea of mutual affection and good will, which nature and duty so forcibly call for, from creatures so helpless in themselves, and who stand in such need of one another’s sympathy and assistance,’ &c. replies to the plea sometimes urged for war under the Christian dispensation, from its being ‘*allowed* to the Jews.’

‘That wars are mentioned in the Old Testament to have subsisted before the time of our Saviour’s appearance upon earth, makes nothing in its favour under the dispensation of peace and universal love, under which we now live, and which he came to establish. The apostle, in the description he gives of the occasion of war, makes no distinction between present and past times, but centres the origin of war wholly in those lusts which war against the soul, “ye fight, ye kill, and desire to have, that ye may spend it upon your lusts.” Hence there is reason to conclude, wars were allowed to the Jews for the same reason, as our Saviour tells them, Moses suffered them to put away their wives, because of the hardness of their hearts, and was a violence upon that purity and brotherly love, which subsisted in the beginning.’*

‘No language,’ says Verax, ‘can be more inconsistent with the admission of a divine command in favour of war.’ Yes, the language of H. Barnard is more inconsistent, who denies that war was *allowed* under the Jewish, *any more* than under the Christian dispensation, for she denies that there has been any diversity in the divine dispensations in condescension to the weakness and imperfection of human nature, to restore it out of its fallen state.—She says she believes that their wars were permitted but not commanded—what idea she attaches to this permission, will best appear by her own illustration of it. ‘That he (the Almighty) has seen meet,’ says she, ‘to *permit* men, to commit moral evils of many kinds and degrees, I readily allow, for who is not capable of seeing that the Almighty does not please at all times to interpose, by the immediate exertion of his power, between the sword of the assassin, and the unsuspecting and innocent victim of his avarice or ambition, yet his thus permitting it, does by no means prove his positive command, or even approbation of the deed, &c.’† Apply this

* Benezet’s Plainness, &c. p. 13, 14.

† Appeal, p. 54.

this reasoning to the wars of the Israelites recorded by Moses and Joshua, and it follows that the assassin whose avarice and ambition induce him to commit murder, has equal right to claim the divine sanction for his conduct, as Moses and Joshua had for theirs. Will the words of A. Benezet admit of such a construction; does he not distinguish between the Mosaic and Christian dispensations, by denominating the latter ‘the dispensation of peace and universal love,’ which Christ ‘*came to establish?*’

By the law of Moses, war, divorce, oaths, &c. were allowed to the Israelites; but under the gospel dispensation Christ forbids the practice of them to his followers, as inconsistent with the more pure and spiritual nature of his dispensation, which calls upon us to be perfect even as our Father which is in heaven is perfect; of which dispensation the law was only the outward type and figure, ‘that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience.’ The imperfection of the law when compared with the gospel, does not imply any variableness, or shadow of turning in the Deity; no, his design is one and uniform, and harmonious in all its parts; the law was instituted by divine wisdom as a school-master to prepare the mind of man for the coming of Christ: not one jot nor one tittle was to pass away until its design and purpose were fulfilled in him to whom all its types and shadows pointed, *the law was the gospel begun, the gospel was the law fulfilled or finished*; the law was suited to the state of mankind at the time of its delivery, their hearts were then too hard, or not capable of receiving an immediate communication of the full effulgence of gospel light.

As to the origin of war, we find by the Old Testament that it existed long before the time of Moses, and we may with A. Benezet attribute its origin to those lusts which war against the soul. Sin may indeed be considered as the primary cause of all war since the creation of the world, not excluding even those of the Israelites under Moses and Joshua, &c.—Had not the Canaanites been ‘idolaters, sacrificers of their own crying or smiling infants; devourers of human flesh, addicted to unnatural lust, immersed in the filthiness of all manner of vice, so that the very land was sick of them, and forced to vomit them forth, as the stomach disgorges itself of a deadly poison,’ no divine commission had gone forth from the Father of mercies for their destruction; whose compassion for mankind would not suffer the contagion to spread itself, but cut off the infected part for the preservation of the body. The Israelites as I have before said, were appointed by the Almighty to perform this operation, and the proofs of their being thus appointed are so irrefragible, that they cannot be rejected without rejecting the divine authority

almost all the books of the *Old Testament*, not to say any thing of the *New*.

The Israelites were also allowed by their law to defend by the sword their kingdom and country, against the attacks of the neighbouring nations, and the wars they engaged in, seem to have been chiefly in their own defence, and not for purposes of aggrandizement and ambition. This permission to defend themselves by the law of God is what, I apprehend, A. Benezet adverts to, in the passage cited from him; consequently no proof that he believed their wars against the Canaanites were contrary to the command and will of God.

There is a long extract given in the Appeal from William Paley as controverting the assertion of the respondent, that H. B.'s sentiments on the Jewish wars are 'absolutely incompatible with an assent to the truth of the text, in many parts of Exodus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, &c. in any sense whatever; that no latitude of construction would admit of such an interpretation; and that therefore it implied a positive disbelief of those numerous passages wherein these awful events are recorded; indeed, of the authenticity of the whole Pentateuch or five books of Moses.' The passage from Paley, is in his *Evidences of Christianity*. I shall not transcribe the whole, but only what will be sufficient to prove its misapplication.

'Undoubtedly,' says Paley, 'our Saviour assumes the divine origin of the Mosaic institution: and independently of his authority, I conceive it to be very difficult to assign any other cause for the commencement or existence of that institution; especially for the singular circumstance of the Jews adhering to the unity, when every other people slid into polytheism, for their being men in religion, children in every thing else; behind other nations in the arts of peace and war, superior to the most improved in their sentiments and doctrines relating to the Deity. Undoubtedly also, our Saviour recognises the prophetic character of many of their ancient writers. So far we are bound as Christians to go; but to make Christianity answerable with its life, for the circumstantial truth of each separate passage of the Old Testament, the genuineness of every book, the information, fidelity, and judgment of every writer in it, is to bring, I will not say great, but unnecessary difficulties into the whole system.—Some objections of this class [made by infidels] are founded in misconstruction, some in exaggeration; but all proceed upon a supposition which has not been made out by argument, viz. that the attestation, which the author and first teachers of Christianity gave to the divine mission of Moses and the prophets, extends to every point and portion of the Jewish history, and so extends, as to

‘ make Christianity responsible in its own credibility, for the
 ‘ circumstantial truth, I had almost said for the critical exact-
 ‘ nefs of every narrative contained in the Old Testament.’*

Paley admits that the truth of Christianity is involved in the truth of the divine mission of Moses and the prophets. Now the charge of the respondent is, that H. B.’s sentiments imply a positive disbelief of the authenticity of the whole pentateuch, or five books of Moses, consequently of his divine mission; so that this passage of Paley’s so far from being in her favour, makes against her.

The connexion between the Jewish and Christian dispensations is so ably pointed out by Campbell in his *Dissertation on Miracles* (a work to which Paley also refers his reader) that our examination of the first article of accusation cannot be more suitably concluded than in his words:—

‘ I believe it will require no elaborate disquisition to evince,
 ‘ that these two, JUDAISM and CHRISTIANITY, are of all that
 ‘ have subsisted, or now subsist in the world, the only religions
 ‘ which claim to have been attended in their first publication
 ‘ with the evidence of *miracles*. It deserves also to be remarked,
 ‘ that it is more in conformity to common language, and inci-
 ‘ dental distinctions which have arisen, than to strict propriety,
 ‘ that I call Judaism and Christianity two religions. It is true,
 ‘ the Jewish creed, in the days of our Saviour, having been cor-
 ‘ rupted by rabbinical traditions, stood in many respects, and
 ‘ at this day stands, in direct opposition to the gospel. But it
 ‘ is not in this acceptation that I use the word Judaism. Such
 ‘ a creed, I am sensible, we can no more denominate the doc-
 ‘ trine of the *Old Testament*, than we can denominate the creed
 ‘ of Pope Pius the doctrine of the *New*.—But when, on the
 ‘ contrary, we consider the religion of the Jews—solely as the
 ‘ religion that is revealed *in the law and the prophets*, we must ac-
 ‘ knowledge, that in this institution are contained the rudiments
 ‘ of the gospel. The same great plan carried on by the divine
 ‘ providence, for the recovery and final happiness of mankind,
 ‘ is the subject of both dispensations. They are by consequence
 ‘ closely connected. In the former we are acquainted with
 ‘ the *occasion and rise*, in the latter more fully with the *progress*
 ‘ and *completion* of this benign scheme. It is for this reason that
 ‘ the scriptures of the *Old Testament*, which alone contain the
 ‘ authentic religion of the SYNAGOGUE, have ever been acknow-
 ‘ ledged in the CHURCH, an essential part of the *gospel revela-*
 ‘ *tion*. The apostles and evangelists, in every part of their
 ‘ writings, pre-suppose the truth of the Mosaic economy, and

‘ often found both their doctrine and arguments upon it,’
&c.*

I shall not detain the reader long in my reply to the strictures of Verax on the next article of the charge, which adverts to the command given to Abraham to offer up his son Isaac. H. Barnard’s want of candour and ingenuity in delivering her opinions will be evinced by her answer to the observation of some of the committee of the morning meeting, that they considered her remarks on the divine command to Abraham, to imply or amount to a disbelief of it. ‘ On which she reminded them,’ the *Appeal* informs us, that “ they had not heard her intimate “ any disbelief of the fact, as there stated, which she thought “ was full in her favour, that whatever was the ground of “ Abraham’s belief that it was his duty to make the pre- “ parations there described, he was absolutely forbid, by the “ Almighty, to carry the deed into execution;” ‘ but she had ‘ candidly acknowledged to the Committee, that it appeared ‘ to her, “ very inconsistent with the divine character, to suppose “ it was actually his will, that it should be done, and then im- “ mediately after positively forbid it.”†

That H. B. was ingenious in evading an open acknowledgment of her opinions, when questioned upon them, we see by these truisms whereby she avoided a direct, ingenuous avowal of them. They leave the enquirer uninformed, except by inference, what her belief, with regard to the command to Abraham, is: for the fact or attempt to sacrifice might be true, supposing Abraham had received no command from God to make it. The committee of the monthly meeting, thinking that *all* she intended was to deny it to have been the will of the Almighty, when he gave the command to Abraham, that he should *actually* sacrifice his son, induced them to drop this part of the charge. From the *Appeal* it will, however, appear that this was not all she meant by the words quoted, for it says,

‘ But had the committee‡ well considered that on this occasion, ‘ the text expressly says, “ That God did tempt Abraham.” ‘ And if the whole passage must be understood, in a strict literal sense, this must also, but that will make it directly contradict the positive declaration of the apostle, “ Let no man say,

* Campbell on Miracles, Vol. I. p. 145, 146, 147. 3d Edit.

† *Appeal*, p. 79, 80.

‡ Of the morning meeting.

“ when he is tempted, I am tempted of God : for God cannot
 “ be tempted of evil, neither tempteth he any man.” So that
 ‘ after all that is said in the text, of the altar, the fire, the wood,
 ‘ the knife, and the command to Abraham, to offer up his son
 ‘ Isaac for a burnt-offering ; is it not plainly described, although
 ‘ expressed in the strong imagery, so common in the eastern
 ‘ writers,—as a temptation wherewith it pleased the Almighty
 ‘ to permit that Abraham should be tempted ?’*

It must be strong imagery indeed that can convert a direct command from God, into a temptation of the devil. The contradiction between the command to Abraham and the words of the apostle, insinuated in this passage, rests entirely upon the english word *tempt*, which admits of different meanings, to be ascertained by the nature of the subject. *Matthew’s*, *Cranmer’s*, and the *Geneva* versions of the Bible render it, *did prove Abraham*. Purver’s version has it, *tried Abraham*. This text is thus easily reconciled with the Apostle, without calling into our aid the strong imagery of the eastern writers.

If Abraham had, by attempting to offer up his son for a burnt-offering, only yielded to a temptation of the devil, or to the evil suggestions of his own heart, would the angel of the Lord have called to him out of heaven in language like the following—‘ Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou
 ‘ any thing unto him : for now I know that thou fearest God,
 ‘ seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from
 ‘ me?’ And again, ‘ By myself have I sworn, saith the Lord, for
 ‘ because thou hast done this thing, and hast not withheld thy
 ‘ son, thine only son : that in blessing I will bless thee, and in
 ‘ multiplying I will multiply thy seed, &c.—And in thy seed
 ‘ shall all the nations of the earth be blessed ; because thou
 hast obeyed my voice.’†

H. B. positively asserts that Abraham ‘ was absolutely forbidden by the Almighty to put the deed in execution.’ Is it not equally clear from the text, that Abraham had, by making the attempt, obeyed the voice of him, who stopped his hand from slaying his son ? Is it possible by any *rational* construction, or sound criticism, to interpret the text as introducing two opposite agents, one giving the command, the other forbidding its execution ? Does not the Lord, when withholding his hand from slaying his son commend him for his ready obedience, which he would not have done, if Abraham had not by his conduct obeyed his voice, but the voice of another ?

The Scripture does not authorise a conclusion that it was the will of God that Abraham should actually sacrifice his

* Appeal, p. 80.

† Gen. xxii. 12. 16, 17, 18.

son; all the objections raised against it upon that supposition, are therefore baseless. The only deduction that can be drawn from it is, that it was the will of the Almighty closely to prove the faith of Abraham, by commanding him to do an act, an obedience to which would, to the eye of reason only, blast all the promises he had received through Isaac. That strangers to a lively, operative faith in the promises of God, should stumble at these things, is no more than might be expected: they cannot account for Abraham's faith in the divine promises, at the moment he was, in obedience to God, going to sacrifice his son, through whom these promises were to be fulfilled: but the apostle Paul, who knew the power of true living faith, silences all such objections—'By faith,' says he, 'Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises, offered up his only begotten son, of whom it was said, that in Isaac shall thy seed be called: *accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead; from whence also he received him in a figure.*'*

The vow of Jephthah and its attendant circumstances, mentioned in the *Appeal*, will not assist to illustrate the present subject, for, to say nothing of his having received no divine command, as did Abraham, the *letter* of the text *without any eastern imagery*, plainly admits of Thomas Ellwood's construction; for example, instead of 'whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet me, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt-offering,' it may be read as in the margin of our Bibles, 'or I will offer it up for a burnt-offering,' and before the performance of this vow, Jephthah's daughter and her companions do not bewail her untimely death, but her *virginity*. If she had really been sacrificed, of the two, the former would surely have been the greater evil to have lamented: besides, the only consequence that is mentioned as resulting from the performance of Jephthah's vow is, that his daughter continued a virgin, and that 'the daughters of Israel went yearly to talk with the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in a year.'† From the whole we have therefore reason to conclude she was not sacrificed, but only devoted or consecrated to the service of the Lord, and so was not permitted to marry, which was a peculiarly trying circumstance to

* Heb. xi. 17, 18, 19.

† I have adopted the marginal reading of our Bibles. Purver, who is remarked for preserving a rigid fidelity to the Hebrew original, translates it, 'From year to year the daughters of Israel went to talk to the daughter of Jephthah.' In his note upon this passage he says, 'To talk to] which is exactly the Hebrew, the verb is found once more in the same conjugation, where our translators have turned it

Jephthah, for she being his only child, with her were cut off his hopes of transmitting his name down to posterity; it was likewise not a small trial to his daughter, since the women among the Jews considered it a misfortune to have no children, from a hope each entertained that the Messiah might descend from her. More might be said in favour of this construction, but sufficient has been advanced to prove Jephthah's vow to be inapplicable to the case of Abraham, Verax's construction of it being repugnant both to the letter and spirit of the whole narrative.

After 'supposing the common and literal interpretation,' of the command to Abraham, 'is not the true one,' Verax proceeds—'Of which, the whole of the comment of William Penn, 'on the subject, in his *No Cross no Crown*, chap iv. § 12, 13. 'would naturally lead one to suspect, he must have had some doubts; as he insists so strongly on Abraham's confidence in the previous divine promise, and the fulfilling thereof, through his son Isaac's seed. "For he received him in a way, that would let him doubt of nothing, that God had promised of him." 'After making a number of judicious and excellent reflections, some of which seem to be expressly calculated, to prevent any of his readers from conceiving such a sacrifice could be required at their hands, he adds,' "The way to keep our enjoyments, is to resign them; and though that be hard, it is sweet to see them returned, as Isaac was, to his father Abraham, with more love and blessing than before." 'And the manner in which he says, "Abraham might naturally enough have argued," 'is, that' "This command is unreasonable and cruel; it is the tempter's, it cannot be God's. For is it to be thought, that God gave me a son to make a sacrifice of him? That the father should be the butcher of his own child?" 'Again,' "That he should require me to offer up the son of his own promise, by whom his covenant is to be performed, this is incredible." 'Which shows,' adds Verax, 'what strong overwhelming evidence, in William Penn's mind, could alone have justified Abraham's belief, that such an action was required of him.*

For us to be satisfied whether these extracts are of any avail to the argument of the *Appeal*, it is necessary to know if W.

* *rehearfe*. Jun. and Trem. say, *to talk with the daughter*. Leo Jud. *that they might discourse with the daughter*, which the Chald. word תנור as Grotius here observes, rightly signifies.—Kimhi writes on the preceding verse—"He made a house for her, and put her there, where she was separated from mankind, and from the ways of the world, and the daughters of Israel went to her," &c.

* *Appeal*, p. 81.

Penn believed Abraham had not received this ‘overwhelming evidence’ that ‘could alone have justified his belief;’ of this Verax has observed a total silence, for reasons that will be sufficiently obvious to every one who has read the whole W. Penn says on this subject in the thirteenth section referred to. I will transcribe it, the roman as usual distinguishing the parts culled out by Verax.—After mentioning the birth of Isaac, W. Penn continues—

‘Yet God called for this darling, their only child, the joy of their age, the son of a miracle, and he upon whom the fulfilling of the promise made to Abraham did depend. For this son, I say, God called: a mighty trial, that which one would have thought, might very well have overturned his faith, and stumbled his integrity; at least have put him upon this dispute in himself: This command is unreasonable and cruel; it is the tempter’s, it cannot be God’s; for is it to be thought that God gave me a son to make a sacrifice of him? That the father should be butcher of his only child? Again, that he should require me to offer up the son of his own promise, by whom his covenant is to be performed: this is incredible. I say, thus Abraham might naturally enough have argued, to withstand the voice of God; and indulge his great affections to his beloved Isaac. But good old Abraham, that knew the voice that had promised him a son, had not forgotten to know it, when it required him back again: he disputes not, though it looked strange, and perhaps with some surprise and horror, as a man. He had learned to believe, that God that gave him a child by a miracle, could work another to preserve or restore him. His affections could not balance his duty, much less overcome his faith, for he received him in a way that would let him doubt of nothing that God had promised of him. To the voice of this Almighty he bows, builds an altar, binds his only son upon it—stretches forth his hand to take the knife: but the angel stopped the stroke, hold “Abraham, thy integrity is proved.” What followed? A Ram served, and Isaac was his again. This shows how little serves, where all is resigned, and how mean a sacrifice contents the Almighty, where the heart is approved. So that it is not the sacrifice that recommends the heart, but the heart that gives the sacrifice acceptance. God often touches our best comforts, and calls for that which we most love, and are least willing to part with. Not that he always takes it utterly away, but to prove the soul’s integrity, to caution us from excesses, and that we may remember God, the author of those blessings we possess, and live loose to them. I speak my experience: the way to keep our enjoyments is to resign them; and though that be hard, it is sweet to see them returned, as Isaac was to his father Abraham, with more love and blessing than before. O stupid world! O worldly Christians! Not only

*'strangers, but enemies to this excellent faith! And whilst so, the
'rewards of it you can never know.'**

No remark upon this passage of W. Penn's is necessary to convince the reader of Verax's perversion of it, and of the scripture upon which it is an excellent comment.

We have now gone through those articles of the charge against H. B. that relate to the *Old Testament*, the objections to them, started by Verax, are 'the exploded and frequently refuted objections of Morgan, Tindal, and Bolingbroke,' and of their superficial successor in the work of vilifying Scripture, the notorious Thomas Paine. And if these objections are sufficient to overturn the divine authority of the *Old Testament*, which is their manifest tendency, the same fate inevitably attends the *New*.

* Penn's Works, Vol. I. p. 288, 289.

CHAP. IX.

A continuation of the same subject—On the Miraculous Conception and Birth of Christ.—Of JOB SCOTT'S Sentiments on the Divinity of Christ and the New Birth.

THE remaining charges against H. Barnard relate to her disbelief of some parts of the New Testament, and are as follows:

‘It further appears, that she is not one with friends in her belief respecting various parts of the New Testament; particularly relating to *the miraculous conception*, and miracles of Christ.’

It is objected in the Appeal, that ‘the first part of this accusation’ is ‘expressed in very general terms, always improper on such occasions,’ and of the whole it is also observed, that ‘it is so indefinite, as to be utterly improper to form any part of an accusation.’ Every objection of this sort must recoil back upon H. B. as being occasioned by her *indefinite* answers to the interrogatories of the committees that visited her, for although the committees were sufficiently convinced of her incredulity in the miraculous conception, and miracles of Christ, as recorded in the New Testament, the ambiguity of her answers induced them to be very cautious in drawing up their reports, that they might give no occasion for cavil, as having wrested the import of her words.

A want of precision in her language manifested itself in her observations in the morning meeting upon these two last charges, which Verax says were, “That she did not find herself authorized to enter into conjectures, or determinations concerning them, but that she did not call them in question.” Adding, “But I freely confess my ignorance, as to their

“ positive and literal certainty, which I could only be assured of,
 “ by immediate revelation, and as such evidence has not been
 “ given me, I have that reason at least to believe, it has not as
 “ yet been absolutely necessary for me to know, as an indivi-
 “ dual in relation to myself, nor yet for my qualification, as a
 “ gospel messenger to others; for I so fully believe in the
 “ power and goodness of God, that I am persuaded he would
 “ long ago have revealed it to me, if his wisdom had seen it
 “ needful for either.”*

I shall not at present any further notice the preceding extract, than as it applies to the *miraculous conception*, it being first and separately considered in the *Appeal*. H. B. said once, when I was in her company, that the first chapters of Matthew and Luke that contain the account of the miraculous conception, had been clearly proved to be spurious: she informs the committees that visit her, that she neither calls in question, nor denies it. How are these incongruities to be reconciled; that in a mixed company and among young people, she should, unsolicited, openly avow her disbelief of an historic fact, which before the committees she said she did not deny? Did ‘ it *never*’ occur ‘ to her mind to practise reserve or concealment, with ‘ respect to any of her religious opinions?’† But it is said that the examination of her by the committees was inquisitorial, and their questions insinuating, because they extended their examination of her opinions, to points not referred to their care. I am informed she was accused openly in the yearly-meeting of ministers and elders of denying the Divinity of Christ, and the miracles as recorded in the New Testament, and that they were included in the subjects referred to the committee appointed by the morning meeting. When she was thus openly accused, ‘ What could be more natural than ‘ to question her concerning the particular points of her faith?‡’ And such inquiries are fully authorized by the following rule made in the year 1694.

‘ If there be any such gross errors, false doctrines, or mistakes, held by any professing truth, as are either against the ‘ validity of Christ’s sufferings, *blood, resurrection, ascension, or* ‘ glory in the heavens, according as they are set forth in the *Scriptures; or any ways tending to the denial of the heavenly man Christ; ‘ such persons ought to be diligently instructed and admonished ‘ by faithful friends, and not to be exposed by any to public re- ‘ proach; and where the error proceeds from ignorance and ‘ darkness of their understanding, they ought the more meekly ‘ and gently to be informed: but if any shall wilfully persist ‘ in error in point of faith, after being duly informed, then such*

* Appeal, p. 60.

† Sequel, p. xiii.

‡ Appeal, p. 45.

‘ to be further dealt with according to gospel order ; that the
 ‘ truth, church, or body of Christ, may not suffer by any par-
 ‘ ticular pretended member that is so corrupt.’ 1694. Written
 ‘ Epistle.*

This rule appears to have been made on a particular occasion, for the Friends were at that time accused by George Keith of converting the outward history of Christ into an allegory; denying his outward appearance, and owning no other Christ, than what was within them: I cannot therefore admit with the author of the *Appeal*, that the above rule necessarily includes all the points they considered ‘ as essential to religious
 ‘ communion.’ But waving this consideration, it contains sufficient to justify the Society’s excluding from its communion any person, let his station be what it may, who holds the sentiments inculcated by H. B. for she refused to acknowledge her belief of the *resurrection* of Christ, and she also denied the atonement of Christ, which is certainly implied, in the expression *his blood*; and that her disbelief of the *miraculous conception* was ‘ tending to
 ‘ the denial of the heavenly man Christ,’ will appear by a paper the Society published, the year before the rule in question was made, which clearly describes the person, the framers of the rule intended by ‘ the heavenly man Christ.’ The following is extracted from it.

‘ Whereas divers accounts have been lately published in
 ‘ print, of some late division and disputes between some per-
 ‘ sons under the name of Quakers in Pennsylvania, about several
 ‘ fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith, (as it pretended
 ‘ by one party,)† which being particularly mentioned, and
 ‘ thereupon occasion very unduly taken by our adversaries to
 ‘ reproach both the Christian ministry, and whole body of the
 ‘ people called Quakers, and their holy and Christian profession,
 ‘ both in England and elsewhere,—We are, therefore, tenderly
 ‘ concerned for truth’s sake, in behalf of the said people (as to
 ‘ the body of them—who are sincere to God, and faithful to their
 ‘ Christian principle and profession), to use our just endeavours
 ‘ to remove the reproach, and all causeless jealousies concerning
 ‘ us, touching those doctrines of Christianity, or any of them
 ‘ pretended (or supposed) to be in question in the said division;
 ‘ in relation whereunto we do in the fear of God, and in simplicity
 ‘ and plainness of his truth received, solemnly and sincerely
 ‘ declare what our Christian belief and profession has
 ‘ been, and still is, in respect to Jesus Christ the only begotten

* Book of Extracts, 2d Edit. p. 50, 51.

† George Keith’s—This paper was published to clear the Society from his calumnies, and perversions of its Christian doctrines.

‘ Son of God, his suffering, death, resurrection, glory, light, power, great day of judgment, &c.’

‘ We sincerely profess faith in God by his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, as being our light and life, our only way to the Father, and also our only mediator, and advocate with the Father. That God created all things, he made the worlds, by his Son Jesus Christ, he being that powerful and living Word of God by whom all things were made; and that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit are one, in Divine Being inseparable; one true, living, and eternal God blessed for ever. Yet that this Word or Son of God in the fulness of time, took flesh, became perfect man, according to the flesh descended and came of the seed of Abraham and David, but was miraculously conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the virgin Mary. And also further, declared powerfully to be the Son of God, according to the spirit of sanctification, by the resurrection from the dead. That in the Word (or Son of God) was life, and the same life was the light of men; and that he was that true light which enlightens every man coming into the world; and therefore that men are to believe in the light, that they may become children of the light; hereby we believe in Christ, the Son of God, as he is the light and life within us; and wherein we must needs have sincere respect and honour to (and belief in) Christ, as in his own unapproachable and incomprehensible glory and fulness: as he is the fountain of life and light, and giver thereof unto us; Christ, as in himself, and as in us, being not divided. And that as man, Christ died for our sins, rose again, and was received up into glory, in the heavens. He having, in his dying for all, been that one great universal offering and sacrifice for peace, atonement, and reconciliation between God and man; and he is the propitiation not for our sins only, but for the sins of the whole world. We were reconciled by his death, but saved by his life.—He is intercessor and advocate with the Father in heaven, and there appearing in the presence of God for us, being touched with the feeling of our infirmities, sufferings, and sorrows. And also by his Spirit in our hearts, he maketh intercession according to the will of God, crying Abba, Father. For any whom God hath gifted and called sincerely to preach faith in the same Christ, both as within and without us, cannot be to preach two Christs, but one and the same Lord Jesus Christ, having respect to those degrees of our spiritual knowledge of Christ Jesus in us, and to his own unspeakable fulness and glory, as in himself, in his own entire being, wherein Christ himself and the least measure of his light or life, as in us, are not divided, nor separable, no more than the sun from its light.—That the gospel of the

‘ grace of God should be preached in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being one, in power, wisdom, and goodness, and indivisible (or not to be divided) in the work of man’s salvation.—That divine honour and worship is due to the Son of God; and that he is, in true faith, to be prayed unto, and the name of the Lord Jesus Christ called upon (as the primitive Christians did) because of the glorious union or oneness of the Father and the Son; and that we cannot acceptably offer up prayers and praises to God, nor receive a gracious answer or blessing from God, but in and through his dear son Christ.’*

Could words more decidedly evince that H. B. by denying the divine or *heavenly* origin of Christ, promoted a ‘denial of the heavenly man Christ?’ The writings of George Fox also further prove that when he and his friends call our Saviour the heavenly man Christ, by the word *heavenly* they understand the Godhead that was united to the manhood.

‘For ye Christians,’ says George Fox, ‘that do confess Christ to be come in the flesh, and yet wont own his light, that he doth enlighten every man that cometh into the world with, to be a *heavenly*, divine, and saving light for every one to believe in, it is but a fleshly profession of Christ,—and not a spiritual, for none can call him Lord, but by the Holy Ghost,—and so the *heavenly spiritual man* is known by the revelation of his light and Spirit;—and so that which does reveal the Son of God, is the light and Spirit of God: to know him to be the Christ, as he was man, and as he was God; I say, to know Christ, the spiritual and *heavenly man*, and his heavenly flesh and blood, that is meat indeed and drink indeed to the saints, which who eats of, lives for ever,’ &c.†

From this it appears that to know Christ ‘as he was God and man,’ and ‘to know Christ, the spiritual and heavenly man,’ are, with G. Fox convertible terms; so that if the accusation of unsoundness against H. B. was not immediately grounded upon, the minute I have quoted, it is manifestly supported by it, and her accusers ‘have had the advantage of acting under the authority of a rule of action, prescribed by the legislature of our Society.’‡ The first article of accusation was only advanced, because it was considered as ‘tending to the denial of the heavenly man Christ,’ through a rejection of the divine mission of Moses, whom H. B. ‘makes out to be a false prophet; but Christ on the other hand, always speaks of him as a true prophet: which of them (if I may without irre-

* Sewel’s History of the People called Quakers, 3d Edit. Vol. II. p. 542 to 546.

† Fox’s Doctrinals, p. 503.

‡ Appeal, p. 230.

‘verence couple them in one relative) knew best, let the reader judge. Here then we have her at variance with Christ. To contradict is not to believe; but no one will say, that believing Christ is not necessary to be a Christian.’*

The reason assigned by H. B. for not acknowledging her belief of the miraculous conception is, that she had not been ‘assured of it by immediate revelation,’ but if R. Barclay (to whom Verax refers us) is to determine the point, her want of belief must be ascribed to her resisting ‘that holy seed, which as minded would lead and incline every one to believe it, as it is offered unto them;’ for ‘though it revealeth not in every one the outward and explicit knowledge of it, nevertheless it always assenteth to it, where it is declared.’

To ascertain the degree of importance that R. Barclay attached to the miraculous conception, and divinity of Christ, it will suffice to turn back to pages 2, 3, 4, 13, 58 to 62, 129, 130, 133 and 134, of this work, as containing a full answer to what is said in the *Appeal* upon his ‘general view of the subject.’

The objection to the phrase *miraculous conception* because ‘not to be found in the Scriptures’ is ‘mere trifling.’ Does not *conception* always precede the birth, and if such conception (as in the case of the Virgin Mary) be described in the Scriptures as supernatural, then it may surely, with the strictest propriety of language, be denominated *miraculous*, without pretending ‘to be wise, above what is written.’ This Verax seems to have been aware of, and therefore he endeavours to prove the first chapters of Matthew and Luke that contain the account of the birth of Christ to be corrupt interpolation. For the sake of the reader of the *Appeal*, I shall, on this subject, as on the subject of the Jewish wars, deviate from my original design by exposing the fallacy of these endeavours to subvert those Scriptures which do not accord with Socinianism.

‘If the other Evangelists and Apostles,’ says Verax, ‘were acquainted with the fact, recorded in the first chapters of Matthew’s and Luke’s histories; it is singular, that none of their writings should contain any mention of this subject, which can be construed into a confirmation of it. Is there any allusion to the miraculous conception, in any of the epistles, and is it not a point likely, if generally received, to have been strenuously insisted upon?’†

* This is taken from a manuscript paper that points out the deistical tendency of H. B.’s rejection of the divine mission of Moses—W. Matthews in his *Recorder* has attempted a reply; but his opponent’s arguments remain yet unrefuted.

† *Appeal*, p. 84.

Experience informs us that it is not when an historical fact is *generally received*, but when it begins to be controverted, that it is most likely to be *strenuously insisted upon*.—Two of the Evangelists relate the manner of Christ's birth, and although the other two do not repeat those accounts, they have expressed what may be *construed into a confirmation of them*. In biography it is usual to give some information, however short, of the descent of the subject of the memoir. This has not been neglected either by Mark or John, for the first introduces his Gospel with these words—'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God.'^{*} This, though brief, is full and comprehensive. As to John, he wrote his Gospel, according to Irenæus, 'designing to root out the error, which had been sown among men by Cerinthus, and long before by those who are called Nicolaitans,'[†] who held (like the Arians afterwards) that the Creator of the world was an inferior and created being, and not the supreme God, also that Jesus was a mere man, and did not exist before his birth by Mary—hence the divinity and pre-existence of Christ is, if possible, more fully set forth by John, than it is in the other Gospels to which his was intended as a supplement. His introduction is striking and emphatical.

'In the beginning' says the beloved disciple, 'was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made—He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not—And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth.' 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.'[‡] Further on in the same chapter, John the Baptist, bears record of Christ, 'that this is the Son of God.' And afterwards Nathanael, when Christ gave him a proof of his omniscience, confesses from the lively conviction produced upon his mind, 'Rabbi,

* If any person should object that the definite article is not in the Greek before the word *son* in Mark i. 1. I answer, so neither is it in Luke i. 35.—and if Luke, after the remarkable prophetic description which precedes, did not think an article wanting to denote Jesus *the* son, and not merely *a* son, we may the more boldly supply it in both places to render the sense clear in English. And even Wakefield, a professed Socinian, has *the son* in both places.

† Epiphanius and Jerom ascribe the origin of St. John's Gospel to the same occasion.

‡ John i. 1 to 18.

‘ thou art the Son of God, thou art the king of Israel.’* Are these united testimonies of Mark and John in the introduction to their Gospels, that Christ was *the Son of God*, no corroboration of Luke’s account of the miraculous conception, in which the angel addresses Mary in these words, ‘ The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called *the Son of God*?’† Because our Saviour applied this distinguishing epithet to himself, the Jews took up stones to stone him, ‘ For a good work,’ said they, ‘ we stone thee not, but because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.’‡ From this we see that they considered the language of Christ to imply that he was God, and his answer was so far from giving satisfaction, that they persisted in their resolution to kill him: their reason for persecuting him even to death is thus described—‘ The high priest asked him, and said unto him, ‘ Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, ‘ I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, What need we any further witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy: what think ye? and they all condemned him to be guilty of death.’§ And when Pilate informed the Jews that he found no fault in him, they answered, ‘ We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.’||

Thus the evangelists Mark and John not only begin their narratives by informing us of the divine origin of Christ, but they also attribute his being put to death by the Jews to his asserting his Divinity. If any urge that since our Saviour calls himself the Son of man, he cannot consistently therewith be considered as God—let such recollect that those who believe in the Deity of Christ, believe him also to be son of David and Mary according to the flesh; also that this objection to Christ’s Divinity because he was man, is no other than the old objection of the Jews, who told our Saviour that they stoned him not for a good work, but because he being a man made himself God.

As to Philip’s calling Christ ‘ Jesus of Nazareth the son of Joseph,’ does not Luke say that he was the reputed son of Joseph? Was it not therefore necessary for Philip to describe him as such to Nathanael, in order to distinguish whom he meant, since Jesus was no uncommon name among the Jews? Our Lord being denominated of Nazareth does not afford the slightest objection to the accounts of his birth, since he was brought

* John i. 34, 49.

† Luke i. 35.

‡ John x, 33.—v. 17, 18.

§ Mark xiv. 61—64.

|| John xix. 7.

up at that place, Joseph and Mary's proper residence. The incidental circumstance mentioned by Luke, accounts for his being born at Bethlehem, and hereby the prophecy of Micah concerning Messiah was literally fulfilled.

The next remark by Verax is, 'The books now deemed 'canonical were not collected into one volume, till many years 'after the decease of all the apostles.' I do not see the connexion, this insulated passage has with the miraculous conception, the subject now before us; but it being, as Watson terms a similar one from T. Paine, 'calculated to mislead the common 'reader,' I shall insert part of what he has quoted from Mosheim in reply.

"The opinions," 'says this author,' "or rather the conjectures of the learned concerning the time when the books of the New Testament were collected into one volume, as also about the authors of that collection, are extremely different.—It is however sufficient for us to know, that, before the middle of the second century, the greatest part of the books of the New Testament were read in every Christian society throughout the world, and received as a divine rule of faith and manners. Hence it appears that these sacred writings were carefully separated from several human compositions upon the same subject, either by some of the apostles themselves, or by their disciples and successors, who were spread abroad through all nations. We are well assured, that the *four gospels* were collected during the life of St. John, and that the three first received the approbation of this divine apostle."*

Mosheim's evidence is also corroborated by Eusebius, Jerom, Lardner, Paley, Percy, and by almost all the writers upon the authenticity of the New Testament.

'In St. Paul's first Epistle to Timothy,' says Verax, 'there is a passage applicable enough to the case, and to the genealogies in particular. In which he cautions Timothy, not "to give heed to fables, and endless genealogies, which minister questions, rather than godly edifying, which is in faith.—From which some having swerved, have turned aside unto vain jangling, desiring to be teachers of the law, understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm." From which,' adds Verax, 'we may learn, that some had, even then, corrupted the simplicity of the primitive faith, by the addition of fables. And as the apostle so closely unites them with the genealogies, if they were then combined, as we now have them, could it more naturally refer to any other

* Watson's Apology, 301 to 303,—also Mosheim, Vol. I. p. 108, 109.

‘circumstance; especially considering his total silence thereon, in all his epistles, except one or two other similar cautions?’*

If the author of the Appeal had followed the advice of the apostle, by avoiding ‘vain jangling,’ the preceding sentence probably had never escaped him. The apostle objects to ‘*endless* genealogies; it cannot therefore have even a distant reference to the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, which are so far from being *endless*, that they begin with Adam and *end* with Christ. The apostle more probably alluded to the Gnostics, a sect in the Christian church that began to make its appearance in the first rise of Christianity, but did not become conspicuous until the second century, when it was opposed by Irenæus, who represents it ‘as introducing into religion certain vain and ridiculous genealogies, i. e. a kind of divine processions or emanations, [which were called æons] and that had no other foundation but in their own wild imagination.’†

But whatever was the apostle’s meaning, if the two first chapters of Matthew and Luke were added, as Verax is afterwards bold enough to suppose by the Pagan converts of the second century, it was impossible for him who wrote in the first century to advert to *them*. Could we have a more convincing proof of the little regard due to Verax’s conjectures, than their thus contradicting each other? If the authority of this, or any other part of scripture could be shaken by loose and vague conjectures, unsupported by proof, the Deist and Atheist would long ere now have triumphed over Christianity.

Verax objects to the two genealogies as inconsistent with each other. Watson replies to T. Paine on this subject—‘There is a disagreement between them, therefore you say “If Matthew speak truth, Luke speaks falsehood: and if Luke speak truth, Matthew speaks falsehood; and thence there is no authority for believing either; and if they cannot be believed even in the very first thing they say and set out to prove, they are not entitled to be believed in any thing they say afterwards.” I cannot admit either your premises or your conclusion:—not your conclusion; because two authors, who differ in tracing back the pedigree of an individual for above a thousand years, cannot, on that account, be esteemed incompetent to bear testimony to the transactions of his life, unless an intention to falsify could be proved against them.—I cannot admit your

* Appeal, 84, 85.

† From a confusion and diversity in the opinions of the different Gnostic Sects, it is difficult to give a correct view of their notions. For a further account of them, and the various sects in the Christian church that branched from them, see Mosheim’s Eccles. Hist. Vol. I. p. 88, 132, 144, 145, 215, &c.

‘premises; because Matthew speaks truth, and Luke speaks truth, though they do not speak the same truth; Matthew giving the genealogy of Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus, and Luke giving the genealogy of Mary, the real mother of Jesus. If you will not admit this, other explanations of the difficulty might be given; but I hold it sufficient to say, that the authors had no design to deceive the reader, that they took their accounts from the public registers, which were carefully kept, and that, had they been fabricators of these genealogies, they would have been exposed at the time to instant detection, and the certainty of that detection would have prevented them from making the attempt to impose a false genealogy on the Jewish nation.’*

The objections in the Appeal do not proceed to the same extent as those of Paine, but if they have any force, it must be upon the same principles; since they are evidently intended to overturn the authenticity of the account of the birth of Christ: whereas, according to Watson, the veracity of the evangelists does not necessarily depend upon the accuracy of the genealogies. Does not the above extract likewise show how we may trace ‘the lineal descent of Jesus from David and Abraham’ without considering him as the real son of Joseph?

Luke, in the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles, saying, ‘The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus, of all that Jesus began both to do and teach, until the day in which he was taken up,’ Verax hence infers that he was not the author of the two first chapters of his gospel, the introduction excepted. To deny Luke to have described the birth of Christ, because he professes to describe all that he began both to do and to teach, as it is wholly destitute of proof, is surely a futile deduction. We may presume when these two chapters were thus, as at one stroke, rejected as spurious, the writer did not sufficiently consider the full bearing of his argument, since in his *Vindication of the Appeal*, he has expressed his firm belief in the authenticity of part of the second chapter of Luke, the whole of which he here appears to reject without any exception.

* Watson’s Apology, p. 227 to 230.

Newcome in his translation of the New Testament, so satisfactorily explains the reason of the difference between the two genealogies, that I shall insert his words:—‘I think that St. Matthew gives the *natural* genealogy of Joseph: Jacob, says he, begat Joseph. But I understand St. Luke as giving the *civil* or *legal* genealogy of Joseph, whom that evangelist calls *the son* of Heli. c. iii. 23. Joseph being nearest of kin to Mary, the daughter and sole child of Heli, married her, and had a right to the inheritance of Heli his father-in-law. Joseph, is therefore styled the *son* of Heli, in the Jewish latitude of the word.’

Criticism similar to the foregoing has also been exercised upon the introduction to Luke's Gospel, 'Forasmuch as many have taken in hand, to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things, from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed.'

'Hence it appears,' says Verax, 'that the ministers of the word, as the apostles are here called, were eye-witnesses of those things from the beginning. And how could that refer to any period, or circumstance, previous to the preaching of John the Baptist? Is there any sufficient ground for supposing that the Apostles had, any of them, the least knowledge or expectation of the Messiahship of Jesus, before that time? And could their intimate personal knowledge of those things have commenced at an earlier period, than their being called to be disciples of Jesus, when he began to be about thirty years of age?'

Luke very probably received from the Apostles, his information of the principal part of the transactions relating to the ministry of Christ subsequent to the preaching of John the Baptist. But that none of them had the least personal knowledge of what related to Christ previously to that period, remains for Verax to prove. As to the conception and birth of Jesus, Joseph and the Virgin Mary could be, strictly speaking, the only proper witnesses to certify the truth, and from them, as also from Christ, it is probable the apostles derived their knowledge of it. And might not Luke have obtained his knowledge from the same source, since Mary is supposed to have survived our Lord several years?

Quitting Luke's introduction, our author next advances what he considers as internal marks of the spuriousness of the two first chapters of Matthew. 'The reference made therein' says Verax, 'to the prophecy in Isaiah, to which the writer appeals, as it were, to support the truth of his narrative, will only serve to show, that he totally mistook the object of the prophecy, which, it evidently appears by a perusal of the text, chap. vii & viii was a son of Isaiah's, &c.'†

I have examined this text, and perceive that, to have a clear view of the prophet's meaning, the text takes in, and necessarily extends to the first seven verses of the 9th chapter, the natural connexion of the prophecy showing that they belong to what immedi-

* Appeal, p. 85, 86.

† Ibid. 86.

ately precedes, although separated from it by the arbitrary division into chapters, a division which Verax himself elsewhere condemns as detrimental to a right understanding of the Scriptures. That the first part of the 9th chapter is a continuation of the subject treated on in the 8th is confirmed by the application of this prophecy by Matthew, chap. iv. verse 15 and 16. Lowth, in his translation, has therefore very justly varied from the common division by adding the first seven verses of the 9th chapter to the 8th, as appertaining to the same prophecy.

The assertion that the writer of the first chapters of Matthew's Gospel 'totally mistook the object of the prophecy,' indicates a disregard to the twofold application of many of the Jewish prophecies. Lowth, after remarking that the prophecy contained in the 8th chapter 'concludes at the 6th verse* of chap. ix. with promises of blessings in future times, by the coming of the great deliverer already pointed out by the name of Immanuel, whose person and character is set forth in terms 'the most ample and magnificent,' adds, 'And here it may be observed, that it is almost the constant practice of the prophet to connect in like manner [as in the preceding prophecy] deliverances temporal with spiritual. Thus the 11th chapter, setting forth the kingdom of Messiah, is closely connected with the 10th, which foretells the destruction of Sennacherib. So likewise the destruction of nations, enemies to God, in the 34th chapter, introduces the flourishing state of the kingdom of Christ in the 35th. And thus the chapters from 40 to 49, inclusive, plainly relating to the deliverance from the captivity of Babylon, do in some parts as plainly relate to the great deliverance by Christ.† On the fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter Lowth also says,—

'Agreeably to the observations, communicated by the learned person above-mentioned, [Eustathius] which perfectly well explain the historical sense of this much disputed passage, not excluding a higher secondary sense, the obvious and literal meaning of the prophecy is this: "that within the time that a young woman, now a virgin, should conceive and bring forth a child, and that child should arrive at such an age as to distinguish between good and evil, that is, within a few years, (compare chap. viii. 4.) the enemies of Judah should be destroyed." But the prophecy is introduced in so solemn a manner; the sign is so marked, as a sign selected and given by God himself, after Ahaz had rejected the offer of any sign of his own choosing out of the whole compass of nature; the terms of the prophecy are so peculiar, and the name of the

* Lowth has thrown our 6th and 7th verses into one.

† Lowth's Isaiah, Quarto Edit. p. 67, 68.

‘ child so expressive, containing in them much more than the
‘ circumstances of the birth of a common child required, or
‘ even admitted; that we may easily suppose, that, in minds
‘ prepared by the general expectation of a great deliverer to
‘ spring from the house of David, they raised hopes far beyond
‘ what the present occasion suggested; especially when it was
‘ found, that in the subsequent prophecy, delivered immediately
‘ afterward, this child, called Immanuel, is treated as the Lord,
‘ and Prince of the land of Judah. Who could this be, other
‘ than the heir of the throne of David? under which character
‘ a great and even a divine person had been promised. No
‘ one of that age answered to this character, except Hezekiah;
‘ but he was certainly born nine or ten years before the delivery
‘ of this prophecy. That this was so understood at that time,
‘ is collected, I think, with great probability, from a passage
‘ of Micah, a prophet contemporary with Isaiah, but who began
‘ to prophecy after him; and who, as I have already observed,
‘ imitated him, and sometimes used his expressions. Micah,
‘ having delivered that remarkable prophecy, which determines
‘ the place of the birth of Messiah, “ the Ruler of God’s people,
‘ “ whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting;” that
‘ “ it should be Bethlehem Ephrata, adds immediately, that never-
‘ theless, in the mean time, God would deliver his people into
‘ the hands of their enemies; “ he will give them up, till she,
‘ “ who is to bear a child, shall bring forth,” Mic. v. 3. This
‘ obviously and plainly refers to some known prophecy concern-
‘ ing a woman to bring forth a child; and seems much more
‘ properly applicable to this passage of Isaiah, than to any others
‘ of the same prophet, to which some interpreters have applied
‘ it. St. Matthew therefore in applying this prophecy to the
‘ birth of Christ, does it not merely in the way of accommo-
‘ dating the words of the prophet to a suitable case not in the
‘ prophet’s view; but takes it in its strictest, clearest, and most
‘ important sense, and applies it according to the original de-
‘ sign and principal intention of the prophet.*

In addition to the foregoing I shall notice the objections that
present themselves to interpreting Isaiah’s prophecy, as applying
to his own son, and not to Messiah.

1st. The prophecy says ‘ a virgin† shall conceive;’ it could not

* Lowth’s Isaiah, p. 64, 65.

† Evanfon in his ‘ Dissonance of the four generally received Evan-
‘ gelists,’ says, that this word in the original does not necessarily ‘ signify
‘ any thing more than a woman young enough to bear children.’ When
the violent abettors of a favourite hypothesis reject the generally ac-
knowledgeed import of a scripture passage, having no *stronger* objection
to it than that it does not *necessarily* convey such a meaning, is there

therefore in its strict, literal sense or import apply to Isaiah's *wife*, and unless that Isaiah had had a son by a former wife, she must have been already a *mother*.

2d. The name of the child is Immanuel, whereas Isaiah's is called Maher-shalal-hash-baz, signifying 'to hasten the spoil, 'to take quickly the prey;' which cannot, by any rational construction be interpreted so as to apply to Immanuel.

3d. 'This child Immanuel is treated as the Lord and Prince 'of the land of Judah,' and the delineation of his person and character at the close of the prophecy, can correspond with no person short of Messiah himself—'Unto us a child is born, 'unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his 'shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, 'The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of 'Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there 'shall be no end, upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with 'justice, from henceforth even for ever: the zeal of the Lord 'of Hosts will perform this.'

Will these descriptions attach in any sense to Isaiah's child? With regard to the prediction being partly delivered in the present sense, it is not unusual in the spirit of prophecy to adopt the present for the future, thereby denoting its certain accomplishment. I do not wish to infer that the birth of Isaiah's son was not intended to confirm that part of the prophecy, delivered in the preceding chapter, that relates to the future state of the kingdoms of Israel and Syria: so far otherwise, that I believe it immediately referred to it; but at the same time I consider the child Immanuel had no allusion direct or indirect to the child that was born to Isaiah.

From the whole does it not appear that this remarkable prophecy of Isaiah (as well as that of Micah) points immediately to the birth of Christ, recorded in the gospels. The other passages in the prophets referred to in the 2d chapter of Matthew,

not reason to suspect that they are substituting some strained construction instead of the natural and obvious one, because the latter militates against the hypothesis they wish to establish? Notwithstanding Evanston's *conjectures* to the contrary, I see no satisfactory reason for his supposition that the word which is used in Proverbs xxx. 19. does not mean a *virgin* in its strictest sense. Purver in his note on the 14th verse of the 7th chap. of Isaiah, says, 'Ver. 14. [*Virgin*] see Matt. 'i. 22, 23. That this Hebrew word always signifies so in Scripture, 'may be seen in *Kidder's Demonstration of the Messiah*. P. 2. Ch. 5.' Vide Vol. II. p. 258 to 300. My reason for noticing Evanston in this place is, because of the great similarity between his arguments and those brought by Verax against the genuineness of the first chapters of Matthew and Luke's Gospels.

may be considered as accommodations of the words of the prophets, because again verified in the events recorded, without the evangelist's intending to imply that the event was immediately in the prophet's view. Paley in his *Evidences of Christianity*, p. 3. b. 2. ably exposes the folly of attempting to overthrow the historical credit of the writers of the New Testament, on account of such applications of the words of the prophets to the transactions recorded by them.

The objections of Verax to the quotations from the prophets in Matthew will, if they have any validity, extend to other parts of the apostolical writings; hence I shall annex the testimony of Jortin, who, in his *Remarks on Ecclesiastical History*, has, I think, handled the subject with much perspicuity.

' Passages in the Old Testament which have been applied to Christ, are of four sorts. 1. Accommodations: 2. Direct Prophecies: 3. Types: 4. Prophecies of double senses.

' 1. Accommodations are passages of the Old Testament, which are adapted by the writers of the New, to something that happened in their time, because of some correspondence and similitude. These are no prophecies, though they be said sometimes to be *fulfilled*, for any thing may be said to be *fulfilled*, when it can be pertinently applied. For example, St. Matthew says, " All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world." The meaning is apparently no more than this, that what the Psalmist said of his way of teaching, might justly be said of those discourses of Christ. Thus the apostles frequently allude to the sacred books; and this is no fault, but rather a beauty in writing; a passage applied justly, and in a new sense, is ever pleasing to an ingenious reader, who loves to be agreeably surprised, and to see a likeness and pertinency where he expected none.'

' 2. Direct prophecies are those which relate to Christ and the gospel, and to them alone, and which cannot be taken in any other sense. Such is the 110th Psalm: " The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool, &c." This is as plain as a prophetic description ought to be; it is applicable to Christ alone.'

' 3. A type is a rough draught, a less accurate pattern or model, from which a more perfect image or work is made. Types, or typical prophecies, are things which happened, and were done in ancient time, and are recorded in the Old Testament, and which are found afterwards to describe or represent something which befel our Lord, and which relates to him and his gospel. For example: under the law, a lamb was

‘ offered for a sin-offering, and thus an atonement was made for transgressions. John the Baptist calls Christ “ the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world,” and St. Peter tells Christians that they are redeemed by the blood of “ Christ as of a lamb.” Hence we infer and conclude that the ‘ lamb was a type of Christ ; and upon considering it, we find ‘ that it has all that can be required to constitute a type ; for it ‘ is in many respects a very just and lively representation of ‘ Christ ; the lamb could not commit sin by his nature, nor ‘ Christ by his perfection : the lamb was without bodily spot or ‘ blemish ; Christ was holy and undefiled : a lamb is meek and ‘ patient ; such was the afflicted and much injured Son of God.’

‘ 4. There are prophecies of double senses, which admit no ‘ more than two senses, which are nearly of the same kind with ‘ typical prophecies, and many of which might be cleared up by ‘ observing that the prophet meant one thing, and the Spirit of ‘ God, who spake by him, meant another thing ; for the Holy ‘ Spirit so over-ruled the prophets, as to make them use words ‘ which strictly and rigidly interpreted could not mean what ‘ themselves intended. Somewhat of this kind is the prophecy ‘ of the high priest Caiaphas ; for the spirit of God has some- ‘ times spoken by bad men. When the chief priests and phari- ‘ sees consulted what they should do with Jesus, the high priest ‘ said, “ Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expe- ‘ dient for us that one man should die for the people, and that ‘ the whole nation perish not.” ‘ His meaning was plainly ‘ this, that it mattered not whether Christ were guilty or inno- ‘ cent, because the public safety absolutely required his death.’ ‘ And this spake he,” (says St. John,) “ not of himself ; but, ‘ being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die ‘ for that nation,” ‘ that is, be a sacrifice and atonement for ‘ their sins. He prophesied then, and knew it not ; for he had ‘ himself another intent and meaning. Daniel xii. 8, 9, says, ‘ that he knew not the meaning of the prediction which he ‘ delivered. Moses said of the paschal lamb, “ Neither shall ‘ ye break a bone thereof,” St. John says that this was ful- ‘ filled in Christ ; whence it has been not unreasonably inferred, ‘ that those words had, with the most obvious sense, a prophe- ‘ tical, that is a double sense.’*

Here is a sufficient answer to the supposed irrelevance of some of the passages in the Old Testament quoted in the New, without reflecting upon the *judgment*, much less the *historical credit*, of the evangelists and apostles.

But ‘ the whole of this narration’ of the birth of Christ, (says Verax) ‘ is encumbered with so many difficulties, that

* Jortin’s Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I. p. 125—133.

‘even the pious, honest credulity of Thomas Ellwood, appears to have laboured hard, but in vain, to get over them.’ What are these insuperable difficulties? We are informed that ‘he’ (T. Ellwood) ‘is sorely puzzled to determine, either the time when, or the place where, these “Magi,” as he calls them, offered their presents.’*

Setting aside the air of ridicule and irony in these remarks, what do they say?—that T. Ellwood finds some difficulty to determine points, respecting which the evangelists are totally silent.

Lardner in his ‘Supplement to the Credibility of the Gospel History’ gives it as his decided opinion that Luke, when he wrote his Gospel, had not seen either Matthew’s or Mark’s†. And if we examine Matthew’s and Luke’s accounts of the miraculous conception and birth of Christ, we shall see that they contain irrefragable proofs of not being copied from each other, and yet there is a coincidence between them, that nothing but their being relations of real transactions can account for. Matthew says, Jesus was born at Bethlehem, but does not mention the residence of Joseph and Mary previously to that event: Luke says it was at Nazareth, and mentions the census or enrollment ordered by Augustus Cæsar, as obliging them to go to Bethlehem, so that he was, in consequence of this circumstance, born there. Luke also relates the appearance of angels to some shepherds, and the glorious anthem sung at the birth of Christ, also his parents’ taking him to Jerusalem, and presenting him in the temple agreeably to the law of Moses: these transactions are passed over in silence by Matthew, who, however, records a circumstance omitted by Luke, namely, the wise-men’s

* Appeal, p. 87.

† Origen, Jerom, Epiphanius, and Eusebius, among the ancients, agree that by the *many* who, Luke says, had taken in hand to write histories of Christ, are to be understood, not Matthew and Mark, but some who had attempted what they were not properly qualified to accomplish: this is also the opinion of Grabe, Mill, Doddridge, Lardner, and Michaelis among the moderns.—Luke does not however seem to charge these writers with any bad intention. ‘Those memoirs,’ says Lardner, ‘were not bad or fabulous. But they were imperfect, as I apprehend, to a great degree: nor do I lament the loss of them. I can pay so much deference to the judgment of Christian antiquity, especially the earliest of all, as to believe, that those *many Narrations*, to which St. Luke refers, did not deserve to be preserved, or to be much taken notice of, after the publication of the Gospels of our first three Evangelists. I imagine that when once these came abroad, the former appeared to the faithful so low, and mean, and defective, that they could not bear to see or read them.’ *Supplement to the Credibility of the Gospel History*. Vol. I. Chap. 8.

coming to worship Christ; the consequent massacre of the infants at Bethlehem by Herod; and Joseph's flight, with Jesus and his mother, into Egypt, through an admonition in a dream. In all this, notwithstanding the evangelists relate different incidents, there is no contradiction between them. They both perfectly harmonize in the most important particulars recorded by each. They both state that Mary, a virgin espoused to Joseph, had conceived by the Holy Spirit, before the consummation of the proposed marriage, that Jesus was born at Bethlehem of Judea, but that he was brought up at Nazareth, a city of Galilee, (see Luke iv. 16.) and thence called Jesus of Nazareth.

Matthew's silence, as to the time when, or the place where, the wise-men presented their offerings to Christ, has, of course, left an open field for the conjectures of commentators. If I may venture my opinion on this subject, it is, that after the presentation of Christ in the temple, and his return with his parents to Nazareth, the wise-men came from the East to Jerusalem, where they were directed to go to Bethlehem, but as it is not said they followed this direction, but followed the star, that it led them, most probably, as Ellwood suggests, to Nazareth. Several commentators think, however, that it was to Bethlehem. But to whichever place it was, is not very important, since Matthew agrees with Luke that Joseph and Mary returned with the child Jesus to Nazareth.

The following objection is started by Verax to Matthew's manner of describing Joseph's departure into Galilee, after his return out of Egypt, and to the reason assigned for it, 'On Joseph's return out of Egypt, we are told, that "he turned aside into the parts of Galilee," for fear of Archelaus, where another son of Herod's reigned at that time; and the journey spoken of, as turning aside, must have been almost from one end of Judea to the other.'*

It may be observed that the alarm excited by the birth of Christ seems to have been confined to Jerusalem, the capital of Judea, and its vicinity, so that although during the life of Herod, whose jurisdiction extended also over Galilee equally with Judea, the life of Jesus might not have been secure, even in that distant province of the kingdom, yet after his death, and the division of his kingdom among his sons, Galilee was too remote from Bethlehem and Jerusalem, to occasion much apprehension of danger, especially since we read that *they* were dead who sought the child's life.† By the phrase he turned aside into the

* Appeal, p. 88.

† It is very probable that Antipater, Herod's eldest son, united with his father in seeking the life of our Saviour. The character of Arche-

parts of Galilee,* we may understand that Joseph avoiding the more public road through Judea by Bethlehem and Jerusalem, turned aside, and went by a more private way to Galilee.

Verax says, 'They' (i. e. the accounts of the birth of Christ) 'are wholly unnoticed by our Saviour himself or any of his apostles, throughout the whole account we have of their preaching the gospel: "Not shunning to declare the whole counsel of God." Could this ever have been the case, had they considered it necessary to prove, and to have it believed, that he was not a prophet, like unto Moses, a lineal descendant of David's, of the root of Jesse, like unto his brethren, in all things, sin excepted, the Messiah promised unto the Jews, by so many of their prophets?'†

Were not Matthew and John apostles? is the divine origin of Christ wholly unnoticed by them in their gospels? The epistles of the apostles are of the nature of exhortatory discourses, they therefore rather contain the doctrinal truths that are founded upon the historic facts recorded by the Evangelists, than a recapitulation of those facts. Thus the Divinity of Christ is an apostolical doctrine founded upon the truth of the miraculous conception, and it is a doctrine that is enforced in various parts of the epistles, for many instances of which see a quotation from Robert Barclay, page 2 and 3 of this work.‡

laus, who succeeded Herod in that part of his kingdom, called Judea, (Antipater being dead) will also account for the fears of Joseph respecting him more particularly. For even before he was well established in his government, he ordered, in consequence of some tumult at the temple, his soldiers in among the Jews, who slew above three thousand. (Jof. Ant. B. 17. C. 9. § 3.) 'And in the tenth year of his government,' says Josephus, 'the chief of the Jews and Samaritans, not being able to endure his cruelty and tyranny, presented complaints against him to Cæsar. Augustus, having heard both sides, banished Archelaus to Vienna in Gaul, and confiscated his treasury.' (Ibid. C. 13. § 2.)

* Newcome translates this passage, 'he withdrew into the parts of Galilee.'—Campbell has it 'retired into the district of Galilee.'

† Appeal, p. 88.

‡ The Apostle Peter when addressing the Jews at the day of Pentecost, very properly urges the *miracles* of Christ and his *resurrection* as *proofs* of his being 'both Lord and Christ,' because as to the miracles he could appeal to the Jews' own knowledge, saying, 'as ye yourselves also know,' and as to the resurrection, there were above five hundred brethren, ready to attest the truth of it as being eye-witnesses, therefore these and the gift of the Holy Ghost so eminently poured forth, were to those Jews at that time the proper *evidences* (exclusive of the purity of the doctrine taught) of the Divinity of Christ; the miraculous conception and birth of Christ was not, as more remote from the knowledge of the audience, so proper for the Apostle to appeal to on such an

To the latter part of the above citation I shall reply by enquiring, Who denies Christ to have been a prophet, and as like unto Moses, as the difference between the nature of their dispensations, and their personal characters would admit? Who denies Christ to have been a lineal descendant of David, or that he took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham; and was ‘therefore truly and properly man, like us ‘in all things, sin only excepted?’* Who denies Christ to be the Messiah promised unto the Jews by so many of their prophets?

That the likeness between Moses and Christ does not extend itself to every particular, we are informed by the apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews where he says, ‘Wherefore, holy brethren, ‘partakers of the heavenly calling, consider the apostle and high ‘priest of our profession, Christ Jesus; who was faithful to him ‘that appointed him, as also Moses was faithful in all his house. ‘For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, ‘in as much as he *who hath builded the house*, hath more honour ‘than the house. For every house is builded by some man; ‘*but he that built all things is God*. And Moses verily was ‘faithful in all his house, as a servant, for a testimony of those ‘things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son ‘over his own house: whose house are we, if we hold fast the ‘confidence, and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end. ‘Wherefore as the Holy Ghost saith, To-day if ye will hear ‘his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation, in the ‘day of temptation in the wilderness.—He that despised ‘Moses’s law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses: of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he ‘be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot *the Son of ‘God*, and hath counted the blood of the covenant wherewith ‘he was sanctified an unholy thing, and hath done despite unto ‘the Spirit of grace.’†

I have before mentioned the sense attached by the Jews to the phrase, *the Son of God*; without insisting on it in this place, it must be obvious to every reader, that the apostle has here drawn a much stronger line of distinction between Moses and Christ, than could have been done, if the likeness between them had extended itself to every particular. Upon a comparison, the similitude between them is in many respects very striking. Jortin has reckoned thirty-nine instances of parallel between these two prophets and lawgivers. He concludes his comparison with these words:—

occasion. The Apostle’s silence respecting it, therefore proves nothing in favour of Socinianism.

* See page 44 of this work.

† Heb. iii. 1—8. x. 28, 29.

‘Is this similitude and correspondence in so many things between Moses and Christ the effect of mere chance? let us search all the records of universal history, and see if we can find a man so like to Moses as Christ was, and so like to Christ as Moses was. If we cannot find such an one, then have we found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God.’*

The author of the Appeal also brings forward what he conceives to be collateral evidence against the genuineness of the first chapters of Matthew’s Gospel, ‘If the inhuman massacre of the children,’ says he, ‘really took place, is it credible that no other historian, either sacred or profane, should have noticed so extraordinary an event? As all Judea was, at that time, only a province of the Roman empire, was such power intrusted with, or is it likely Herod would have dared to invest himself with such tyrannical authority, as a tributary prince, subject not only to removal, but punishment?’†

The cursory manner in which the Greek and Roman historians have passed over the history of the Jews, does away every objection to their silence respecting this single instance of Herod’s cruelty; neither is the omission of Josephus the Jewish historian sufficient to invalidate Matthew’s account of this circumstance: for, as Lardner observes, the most exact and diligent historians have omitted many events, that happened within the period of which they undertook to write. Suetonius, Tacitus, and Dio Cassius, have all three written of the reign of Tiberius, but it is no objection to the respective credit of their histories, that each has mentioned some things omitted by the rest. Neither is it any objection against St. Matthew, that he has related an action of Herod, omitted by Josephus.

Josephus gives an account of several pharisees being put to death by Herod, about this time, for certain predictions that God had decreed that Herod’s government should cease, and his posterity be deprived of it, and that Herod slew also all those of his own family who had consented to what the pharisees had foretold.‡ As this happened about the same time, and the occasion was similar to that which produced the slaughter of the infants, may they not have had some connexion? ‘St. Matthew,’ says Lardner, ‘relates only what was done at Bethlehem, Josephus, what happened at Jerusalem. The silence of Josephus about the former, and of St. Matthew about the latter, may be in a good measure accounted for by these considerations. St. Matthew was not concerned to relate state matters, but barely to give the history of Jesus

* Jortin’s Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, Vol. I. p. 148, 149.

† Appeal, p. 87.

‡ Josephus B. 17. C. 2. § 4.

‘ Christ; and therefore all that he was obliged to take notice of upon this occasion was, the attempts made upon the life of Jesus. Josephus’s is a political history of the Jewish nation, and therefore the executions at court might be more suitable to his design.’*

Macrobius, a heathen author at the latter end of the fourth century, has a passage which shows, the truth of Herod’s massacre of the children was fully admitted by him. ‘ When he [Augustus] had heard that among the children within two years of age, which Herod king of the Jews commanded to be slain in Syria, his own son had been killed, he said: It is better to be Herod’s hog than his son.’†

What renders this passage of some weight notwithstanding the lateness of the date at which it was written, is, that Macrobius was a bigoted heathen, and could not therefore be suspected of any design to confirm the truth of the sacred records, neither is it likely that he had much acquaintance with Christian writers; this makes it probable that he transcribed what he relates from some more ancient heathen author now lost. The passage may, at least, be considered as a proof that Herod’s massacre of the children was not only well known, but not controverted by the heathens at the time Macrobius wrote.

Without entering into any discussion how far Judea could be *strictly* considered as a province of the Roman Empire, or Herod a *tributary* prince, at the time of our Saviour’s birth, the least acquaintance with the history of Herod, and the cruelties practised by him, will convince us not only of his power to ‘ invest himself with such tyrannical authority,’‡ but also of its correspondence with his general character.

He murdered, either through jealousy or groundless suspicions, his favourite and beloved wife Mariamne, her brother, grandfather, and the two sons he had by her.

From Josephus we likewise learn that he slew every member of the Sanhedrim in Hyrcanus’s time, except Sameas,§ and that in his last illness when he was past hopes of recovery, he summoned all the chief men of the Jewish nation to assemble at Jericho, which commands were enforced with the penalty of death: when they were come to Jericho, he ordered them all to be shut up in the hippodrome, or circus, and sending for his sister Salome, and her husband Alexas, he said to them, ‘ I shall

* Lardner’s Credibility, Vol. 2. B. C. 2.

† Ibid.

‡ It may be likewise remarked that Herod, from being a retainer of Anthony’s, had become a tool of Augustus, which in so corrupt a court as that of Rome would secure impunity.

§ Josephus’s Antiq. B. 14. C. 9. § 4. Lardner says, all except Hillel and Shamai.

‘ die in a little time, so great are my pains ; but what principally troubles me is this, that I shall die without being lamented, and without such mourning as men usually expect at a king’s death ;’ and in order to afford him some alleviation of his great sorrows, and procure him the mourning he was so desirous to obtain, he requested them immediately on his death to place soldiers round the hippodrome, and give orders that those who were in custody should be shot with their darts : ‘ with tears in his eyes, he entreated them by the kindness they owed to him, and by the faith they owed to God, that they would not hinder him of this memorable mourning at his funeral. So they promised not to transgress his commands.’*

These commands, though never executed, give a finished stroke to Herod’s character, and we may say with Prideaux, that ‘ the history of this his wicked design takes off all objection against the truth of murdering the innocents, which may be made from the incredibility of so barbarous and horrid an act. For this thoroughly shows, that there can be nothing imagined so cruel, barbarous, and horrid, which this man was not capable of doing.’†

But no other sacred historian has noticed it. If we are to reject a fact recorded by one evangelist, merely because it is not noticed by the other three, we shall have very little left of St. John’s Gospel, and each of the others will be considerably abridged. That ‘ omission is at all times a very uncertain ground of objection’ has been sufficiently proved by Lardner, Paley, and others, I shall therefore content myself with observing that if this argument against the gospels be admitted as valid, Josephus’s *Wars of the Jews* might be produced to invalidate his *Antiquities*.‡ The weakness of such an argument must, upon the least consideration, appear to every one: *omission* is no *contradiction*.

Verax intimates that the two first chapters of Luke are additions of those pagan converts of the second century whom Origen so properly calls “ easy-working interpolators,” to whose ‘ labours,’ Verax adds, ‘ many learned and pious Christians have also attributed the two first chapters of Matthew, which are not contained in some of the oldest manuscripts.’§

This last assertion appeared to me of so extraordinary a nature, that I was induced to examine whether there was really any foundation for it. The result of this examination is, that

* Jos. Antiq. B. 17. C. 6. § 5.

† Prideaux’s Connexion of the Old and New Testament. Part 2, B. 9. Vol. 4. p. 925.

‡ Paley’s Evidences, Vol. 2. p. 289 to 294.

§ Appeal p. 86.

there are manuscripts, and some perhaps ancient (although *not the oldest*), which are defective towards the beginning of St. Matthew's Gospel, but then these defects are so manifestly from injury through age, or other causes, that it would be absurd to appeal to them as any evidence on either side; for example, the Alexandrian manuscript, which is one of the most ancient, wants from the beginning of the New Testament to Matth. xxv. 6. Another manuscript is wanting from the beginning to Matth. xviii. 5. There are also others with similar chasms. These manuscripts as much prove against the authenticity of the first 17 or 24 chapters of Matthew as against the two first only.

Herbert Marsh, in his Edition of Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, to whose work I am indebted for the preceding information, has given the evidence of the Greek manuscripts, and of the ancient versions, for and against the authenticity of these two chapters of Matthew so much controverted by Socinians; which I shall transcribe.

‘ In examining the question whether a passage of the Greek Testament be genuine or not, the first question to be asked is, ‘ What is the evidence of the Greek manuscripts, of the ancient ‘ versions, and of the ancient fathers? Now there have been ‘ not less than three hundred and fifty-five Greek manuscripts ‘ of the gospels collated, every one of which contains the two ‘ first chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel, with the exception to the ‘ single Codex Ebnerianus. But even this manuscript contains the ‘ second chapter,* and the more ancient manuscript contained ‘ probably the whole of the first. The evidence of the Greek ‘ manuscripts therefore is decidedly in favour of the authenticity of the two first chapters of St. Matthew's Gospel. ‘ Equally decisive is the testimony of the ancient versions; for ‘ these chapters are contained in all of them. That in some ‘ few Latin manuscripts the genealogy is separated from the ‘ remaining part of the first chapter, and that St. Matthew's ‘ Gospel is made to begin with chap. i. 18, is a circumstance, ‘ which is not only much too trivial to be opposed to the ‘ weight of evidence on the other side, but at the furthest can ‘ affect only the genealogy, and not the *whole* of the two first ‘ chapters. With respect to the quotations of ancient writers, ‘ which form the third kind of evidence, it is sufficient to observe, ‘ that both Clement of Alexandria, and Origen, have quoted ‘ from the two chapters in question, without signifying any ‘ suspicion of their want of authenticity. And what is still ‘ more, even Celsus, the great enemy of the Christian religion

* This MS. begins with the eighteenth verse of the first chapter, the genealogy therefore is all that is omitted.

' in the second century, has quoted them. See Griesbach's
 ' Symbolæ criticæ, tom. 2. p. 241. We must set therefore all
 ' the laws of criticism at defiance, if we assert that the *Greek*
 ' gospel of St. Matthew, to which alone the preceding argu-
 ' ments relate, began with Chap. iii. Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις.
 ' That the Greek Gospel even began in this manner is in itself
 likewise incredible, since no writer, unless something had pre-
 ' ceded, would say "in *those* days." On the other hand, how-
 ' ever evident it may be, that the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew,
 ' from its very first existence, contained the two first chap-
 ' ters, yet, as this Gospel is a translation from the Hebrew,
 ' (that is the Chaldee) of St. Matthew, it is still possible, that
 ' they were not contained in the original, that the original
 ' began, as Epiphanius says the gospel used by the Ebionites
 ' began, with the words, "it happened in the days of Herod
 " the king, &c." that the Greek translator prefixed a translation
 ' of some other Chaldee document containing an account of
 ' Christ's birth, and that, in order to connect it with the com-
 ' mencement of his original, he altered "the days of Herod"
 ' to "those days." All this is possible: but it would be a very
 ' difficult matter to render it probable.* After expressing the
 probability that St. Matthew was the author of the two first
 chapters, he adds as an additional argument ' especially since the
 ' Hebrew gospel used by the Nazarenes really contained them,
 ' and there is great reason to believe that the Hebrew gospel
 ' used by the Nazarenes approached much nearer to St.
 ' Matthew's genuine original, than that which was used by
 ' the Ebionites, since the Nazarenes were descendants of the
 ' first converts to Christianity, the Christians of Judea being
 ' called Ναζωραῖοι, Acts xxiv. 5, while the Greek Christians
 ' were called Χριστιανοί, Acts xi. 26. Absolute certainty on this
 ' subject is indeed not to be obtained for want of sufficient
 ' data: but the same want of data makes it impossible to prove
 ' that St. Matthew was *not* the author of the chapters in
 ' question.*

Since H. Marsh only excepts the Codex Ebnerianus among
 the Greek manuscripts that were collated, those manuscripts
 to which I adverted, such as the Codex Alexandrinus could
 not have been included, because of no authority in deciding

* Marsh's Michaelis's Introduction to the New Testament, Vol. 3.
 Part 2. p. 138.—140. In the text of Michaelis some difficulties at-
 tending the two first chapters of Matthew are pointed out, chiefly re-
 lating to 'quotations contained in them from the Old Testament,' to
 which I have already answered, and for further satisfaction the reader
 is referred to Newcome's notes on the second chapter of Matthew, in
 his translation of the New Testament.

respecting the proper beginning of St. Matthew's Gospel. This we may therefore hope will set the question to rest,* so far at least as the ancient manuscripts are concerned in it.

The bare supposition that the Gospel of the Ebionites and Cerinthians, was the original Hebrew Gospel of St. Matthew, is then all that the Socinians have to oppose to the united testimonies of the most ancient Greek manuscripts, of the most ancient versions, the Hebrew Gospel of the Nazarenes, and the testimonies of the ancient fathers, in favour of the authenticity of the two first chapters of Matthew. And this solitary support must fail them, upon an inspection into the peculiar tenets of the Ebionites and Cerinthians, and from the internal marks of spuriousness that may be discovered in the fragments of their Gospel, preserved in the writings of Epiphanius.

The Ebionites seem to have been a branch of the Nazarenes; some have confounded them together, but the writings of the ancient fathers, and the difference between the gospels received by them, show that they were distinct sects, the latter name probably distinguishing, as H. Marsh observes, the descendants of those first Jewish converts to Christianity who adhered to the law of Moses, whereas the Ebionites deviated in a greater degree from the purity of the faith of those first converts. It is probable from the Apostle Paul's Epistles, that they, or persons of their description, began to trouble the church very early. For the Apostle in his Epistle to the Galatians expresses himself with great zeal against some who wanted to impose the law of Moses upon the Gentile Christians, accusing them of perverting the Gospel of Christ, and even wishes they were separated from the church; hence his zeal so offended the Ebionites, that they, according to Irenæus, utterly rejected all his epistles, calling him an apostate from the law, and only received that which was called the Gospel according to the Hebrews, under the name of Matthew, which, if it ever were a copy of Matthew's Gospel, was so mutilated and adulterated by them, that it was never received by Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, or the fathers, as Matthew's genuine Gospel.

That the Hebrew Gospel received by the Ebionites was not the same as that which was received by the Nazarenes, is evident from the difference in their accounts of the baptism of Christ, which, for the information of those who may not otherwise have an opportunity to compare them, I will give in opposite columns.

NAZARENE GOSPEL,

From Jerome.

‘ It came to pass when the
 ‘ Lord ascended from the wa-
 ‘ ter, the whole fountain of the
 ‘ Holy Ghost descended and
 ‘ rested upon him, and said un-
 ‘ to him, “ My Son, among (or
 ‘ during all the time of) all
 ‘ the prophets, I was waiting
 ‘ for thy coming, that I might
 ‘ rest upon thee, for thou art
 ‘ my rest; thou art my first-
 ‘ begotten Son, who shalt reign
 ‘ to everlasting ages.”

EBIONITE GOSPEL,

From Epiphanius.

‘ —and as he (Jesus) ascended
 ‘ out of the water, the heavens
 ‘ were opened, and he saw the
 ‘ Holy Spirit of God in the form
 ‘ of a dove descending and en-
 ‘ tering into him, and a voice
 ‘ was made from heaven, say-
 ‘ ing, “ Thou art my beloved
 ‘ Son, in whom I am well
 ‘ pleased;” ‘ and then another,
 ‘ I have this day begotten
 ‘ thee;” and suddenly there
 ‘ shone around the place a great
 ‘ light; which, when John saw,
 ‘ he said to him, “ Who art
 ‘ thou, Lord?” ‘ and then ano-
 ‘ ther voice from heaven came
 ‘ to him, “ This is my beloved
 ‘ Son, in whom I am well
 ‘ pleased,” &c.*

From what Jerom says of the Nazarene Gospel of Matthew, it must at least have contained that part of the two first chapters of Matthew which gives the account of the miraculous conception: whether it also included the genealogy, Jerom’s silence makes it impossible to determine with certainty, yet I think his silence a presumptive evidence that it did, since he seems to have remarked upon and quoted those passages only that did not agree with the Greek Gospel of St. Matthew. For had not the Nazarene Gospel put ‘ Bethlehem of Judah,’ instead of ‘ Bethlehem of Judea,’ at Matth. ii. 5. and followed the Hebrew version instead of the Septuagint, in its quotations from the Old Testament, it is likely Jerom would never have referred to the second chapter of that gospel. The Ebionite Gospel began, ‘ It came to pass in the days of Herod, the king of Judea, that John came baptizing, &c.’ entirely omitting the two first chapters. It is not necessary to produce any further proof that the Nazarenes and Ebionites had not the same gospel.

The Gospel of the Nazarenes is cited by Origen and Jerom, not as of any authority, but as apocryphal. I do not find that the Gospel of the Ebionites is quoted by any of the fathers before Epiphanius, who at the same time rejects it as containing false doctrine. The additional voice from heaven at the

* Jones’s new and full Method of settling the Canon of the New Testament, Vol. I. p. 341, 345. Edit. 1726.

baptism of Christ, saying, 'I have this day begotten thee,' has the appearance of being foisted in to support the false doctrines of the Cerinthians, who held that Jesus and Christ were two distinct beings, that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary, and Christ a superior spirit or æon that descended upon him in the form of a dove, at his baptism, and that this union constituted him the Son of God; but that this æon was separated from him at his suffering and death. Irenæus says that the Apostle John wrote his Gospel to controvert the errors of Cerinthus, and I may also add in the words of a modern author, that 'even if Irenæus had not asserted that St. John wrote his Gospel against the Gnostics, and particularly against Cerinthus, the contents of the gospel itself would lead to this conclusion: The speeches of Christ which St. John has recorded, are chiefly dogmatical, and relate to Christ's divinity, the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, &c.'

To conclude my remarks on this spurious Hebrew Gospel. It was never received, but by those who were corrupters of the Christian doctrine from the first rise of Christianity, and opposed as such by the Apostles Paul and John—the fragments of it that have escaped the ravages of time contradict, not to mention Matthew's Gospel, the other three Gospels written by Mark, Luke, and John, and always received by the Christian fathers as the genuine productions of those to whom they are ascribed, it can therefore be considered only as an apocryphal book designed to subvert the genuine doctrines of the Gospel.

And although the Hebrew Gospel received by the Nazarenes, from the manner in which it is mentioned by Origen, Jerom, and Epiphanius, was not, we may conclude, equally corrupt and mutilated as that of the Ebionites; yet if we are to judge of it, by the fragments left, there is no reason to regret its loss.

The doubts of Verax respecting the authenticity of the two first chapters of Luke (excepting the Introduction), can be founded upon nothing but mere conjecture, to support an opinion; (if the same may not indeed be said with regard to the two first chapters of Matthew). The inference made from Luke's introduction to his Acts of the Apostles, and to his Gospel, that he could not be the author of the two first chapters, is, allowing its full force, so entirely negative, that I am surprised any man of common sense should rest upon it. Verax does not refer us to the testimony of the 'oldest manuscripts' against the genuineness of the two first chapters of Luke; he knew, I suppose, that they would decide in favour of it: his silence, however, needs not prevent me from appealing to them as evidence against him.

Notwithstanding Verax has produced no objection of any weight or importance against Luke's account of the birth of

Christ, I shall subjoin a few testimonies from the ancient fathers, as an additional confirmation of its authenticity. Ignatius, who was contemporary with the Apostles, expresses his belief, that Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary. In his Epistles to the Ephesians and Smyrnæins, he does not directly cite the words of either of the Evangelists; in the former epistle it is probable he alluded to Luke, and in the latter to Matthew, this is however of little consequence, as it does not destroy his testimony in favour of the miraculous conception, which is the only circumstance to which we can attribute Verax's attack upon the two first chapters of Luke.

Justin Martyr, *before* the middle of the second century, presented an Apology on behalf of the Christians, addressed to Titus Antoninus Pius, Marcus Antoninus, and Lucius Verus, the Senate and People of Rome; in this Apology are these words:—

‘ At the same time an angel was sent to the same virgin, saying, “ Behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb by the Holy Ghost, and shalt bring forth a son, and he shall be called the Son of the Highest. And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.” As they have taught who have written the history of all things concerning our Saviour Jesus Christ. And we believe them.*

Here is a direct allusion to the first chapters of Matthew and Luke, compare Matth. i. 20, 21, with Luke i. 31. The occasion and period of this testimony by Justin Martyr deserves particular attention. For can we for a moment imagine that he would, in a public apology for the Christians, addressed to the Emperor and Senate of Rome, advert to the miraculous conception, and say that the Christian church believed the history of it written by the evangelists, had it not been generally received at the time he wrote? If he had declared a falsehood, he was certain of immediate detection, for it is not improbable that there were some Christians then living, who had been disciples of the apostles: this apology being presented only about forty years after the death of St. John; and it is supposed by some to have been written before the martyrdom of the venerable Polycarp, that apostle's disciple.

Again in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew, written about the same time, ‘ And the virgin Mary having been filled with faith and joy, when the angel Gabriel brought her good tidings, that the “ Spirit of the Lord should come upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadow her, and therefore that holy thing born of her should be the Son of God, answered: Be it unto me according to thy word.”†

This is taken immediately from Luke i. 35 to 38. In another part of the same Dialogue he mentions the wise-men's coming to worship Christ, Joseph's going with Mary and the young child to Egypt, and Herod's killing the infants at Bethlehem.* This writer at length died a martyr to the Christian faith. To the testimony of Ignatius and Justin Martyr may be added, that of Irenæus, of Tertullian, Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian of Carthage, &c.† Thus the testimony of the primitive church seconds the testimony of the most ancient manuscripts and versions. And, what is before all this, the doctrines inculcated in the other writings of the Apostles and Evangelists confirm the truth of the chapters in question.

Verax may oppose this Appeal to the Scriptures as assuming what he will not grant, nevertheless, I consider myself justified in advancing it; because it is not merely my private opinion, but (as I trust has been shown), the uniform faith of the Society of Friends; therefore until Verax, who professes to be one of them, can prove this is not their faith, or else throw off his assumed character, I am not, as a member of that society, bound to meet him upon the simple ground of the controversy as it rests between the Trinitarian and Socinian, respecting their different construction of those passages of Scripture to which I advert.

From the liberties Verax has taken with the sacred writings, we must not look for more respect to any testimony produced in favour of them; but he is not to conclude that mere declamations and bold assertions will be accepted for arguments, when opposed to the most positive proofs.

The manner in which some queries of George Keith are introduced into this part of the Appeal, and the remarks that accompany them, I cannot consider as reflecting any credit on the candour of Verax. After citing the queries, he makes the following comments:—

‘ These queries, with the answers annexed to each, exhibit
 ‘ a pretty clear general view of the doctrinal points, which
 ‘ George Keith was so urgent with the Society to adopt; and
 ‘ by comparing them with what the Society, in any collective
 ‘ capacity, had then published, or any of the leading members

* This event is also mentioned by Origen in his answer to Celsus, where he says, ‘ Herod put to death all the little children in Bethlehem and its borders, with a design to destroy the king of the Jews, who had been born there.’ Lardner's Cred. of the Gospel Hist. Vol. II. B. 2. C. 2. Origen could not therefore have considered this event as the fabrication of his ‘ easy-working interpolators.’

† For the several testimonies of these fathers, see Lardner's Cred. of Gospel Hist. Part 2. and Supplement; see also Paley's Evidences, Vol. I. Chap. 3 to 9 inclusive.

‘ of it, on the same subjects; a tolerably correct idea may be
 ‘ formed of the nature and extent of the variation in sentiment
 ‘ between them. And they appear to have been also equally dis-
 ‘ cordant in opinion, on the propriety, wisdom, and necessity of
 ‘ laying down precise and specific articles of faith, even if they
 ‘ could have agreed upon terms, as a suitable criterion of com-
 ‘ munion in a religious society; which appears to have been
 ‘ the point that Keith was aiming at, and predetermined to have
 ‘ his own way in, or to separate from the society.’*

I believe pride and chagrin at not carrying certain points respecting the discipline which he had proposed to the Yearly Meeting of Philadelphia, rather than difference of sentiment, was the cause of George Keith’s separation from the society; for it was but a few months before this separation that he had published a book in defence of the Friends’ principles.

Of the queries of Keith, the fifth being the most to the point, I shall cite the first part of it—‘ Do you believe that
 ‘ Christ or the Eternal Word was so made flesh, as that he truly
 ‘ and really became man, as truly man as he was God?’ When queries are put in this public manner, it usually implies a suspicion that the party to whom they are addressed maintains the counter-position; we may therefore conclude that Verax intended to make this impression on the reader by giving Keith’s queries, without a single extract from any of the papers the Society had written in reply to Keith. He began to trouble the Friends in the year 1692, accusing them of holding ‘ damnable heresies and doctrines of devils.’ In 1693, they fully cleared themselves from these injurious aspersions by publishing a paper, entitled, *The Christian Doctrine and Society of the People called Quakers, cleared, &c.* signed by George Whitehead, and several others, on behalf of the Society. From this paper an extract is given in page 204, which entirely precludes the necessity of any further answer to Keith.

That the Society did not refuse to lay down specific articles of faith, if that would have satisfied George Keith, appears from the testimony of denial issued against him by the monthly meeting in Philadelphia; from which the following is extracted:

‘ He hath often quarrelled with us about confessions, declar-
 ‘ ing that he knew none given forth by the body of Friends to
 ‘ his satisfaction, and often charged most of us with being
 ‘ unsound in the faith. We have offered in several meetings
 ‘ for his satisfaction, and to prevent strife amongst us, and for
 ‘ preserving the peace of the church, to deliver a confession of
 ‘ our Christian faith, in the words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus
 ‘ Christ, the author of the Christian faith, and in the words of

‘ the apostles, and disciples, his faithful followers ; or we would declare our belief in testimonies of our ancient Friends and faithful brethren, who were generally received by us ; or we would concur and agree upon a confession, and have it transmitted for the approbation of the Yearly Meeting here, or the Yearly Meeting at London ; yea, it was offered unto him at the same time that a confession concerning the main matters of controversy, should be given out of a book of his own ; but all was slighted as insufficient.*

So far were the Friends from refusing to draw up terms of communion, or a confession of their Christian faith, that they even cheerfully and willingly proposed it to George Keith, by whom it was rejected, his discontent proceeding from another cause.†

I have already been so diffuse on the sentiments of the early Friends respecting the person of Christ, that I shall decline producing any further evidence to justify the present article of accusation against the exceptions of Verax, afresh urged in this part of his work.

* Gough’s History of the Quakers, Vol. III. p. 335, 336.

† George Keith and his abettors seem to have practised the same mode of attack upon the writings of Friends, that has been since adopted by Verax, the following complaints of unfairness being made against them.

‘ The words and passages brought by our adversaries for proof of their charges against us, are not taken out of our doctrinal treatises, or declarations of faith and principles ; but (for the most part) out of controversial books ; wherein, oftentimes, the scope and aim of the author is, not so much to assert or express his own principles or doctrines, as to impugn and expose his adversaries, by showing the contradictions, absurdities, and ill consequences of his adversaries’ opinions : from whence, positively to conclude the author’s own judgment, is neither safe nor fair.’ Gough’s History, Vol. III. page 393.

George Keith pretended ‘ to prove that George Whitehead denied Christ to be God,’ notwithstanding he could not have been ignorant that George Whitehead had published a book under the title of ‘ *THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST, and Unity of Three, &c. confessed and vindicated by his Followers, called Quakers* ; but instead of appealing to this book, he refers to another book of George Whitehead’s, entitled, *The Light and Life of Christ within*. (See Sewel’s History of the Quakers, 8vo Edit. Vol. II. p. 578.) Does not Verax’s perversion of Penn’s controversial tract, called *The Sandy Foundation shaken*, correspond with the conduct of George Keith ? Are not their writings intended to prove the same positions ?

THIS Chapter might have closed here, had not the sentiments of a late approved minister on the Divinity of Christ and the New Birth, been publicly arraigned in the *Sequel to the Appeal*, as tending to *Atheism*. Justice to the individual, and to the Society, will not permit it to be passed over without animadversion.

This strange charge is introduced by a *private* letter from Ann Alexander to Robert Ransome, which, but for a breach of confidential friendship, would probably have never met the public eye. In this letter are the following expressions of the late Job Scott.

‘I trust, I as firmly believe in the Divinity of Christ, as any man living; but I have no more belief that there are two Divinities than two Gods. It is altogether clear to my mind, that that one Divinity actually became the seed of the woman, and bruised the serpent’s head, as early as ever any man ever witnessed redemption from sin, and is one in the head, and in all the members, he being like us in all things, except sin. My only hope of eternal salvation is on this ground; nor do I believe there has been any other possible way of salvation, but that of a real conception and birth of the Divinity in man.’*

This is the language in which the tendency to Atheism is discovered by Verax’s ‘much valued friend,’ who has communicated to him this wonderful discovery in some *Remarks* upon it, and they have appeared to Verax so valuable, that to rescue them from oblivion he has given them a place in his work.—His friend being equally anonymous with himself, to prevent circumlocution, I shall consider Verax as the author.

Our Remarker, after noticing the different explications of the phrase *Divinity of Christ*, and that it is applied to our Saviour by the Trinitarian, Arian, and Unitarian, ‘though with meanings evidently different from each other,’ observes that ‘by many persons in our Society, and probably by Ann Alexander, these expressions of Job Scott’s are conceived to assert his belief in the Divinity of Christ, as being, in the strict, literal, and unqualified meaning of the terms, one with the Father.’† Verax then proceeds to give what he apprehends to be the purport of these expressions, but he has so confused his argument by the introduction of Platonic phrases, that it is difficult to connect his reasoning with his subject.

I shall not enter into abstruse disquisitions respecting the nature of the soul, but simply consider whether Job Scott was not sincere when he said, that he as firmly believed in the Divinity of Christ as any man living; and whether he believed

* *Sequel*, p. 95.

† *Ibid.* 99, 100.

Divinity to be 'an inseparable attribute' of 'the souls of virtuous men.' A death-bed is not the time that it is usual for a person to belie his genuine sentiments, and Ann Alexander who attended him in his last illness, bears this testimony concerning him, that his 'dying expressions to those around him, most fully evinced his belief in the Divinity of Christ, and the blessed effects of attending to his inward and spiritual appearance.' This is also corroborated by many passages in his 'Journal, and his Treatise on Baptism. The following selection was published in the Pamphlet, entitled, *Some Tracts relating to the Controversy between H. Barnard and the Society of Friends.* I shall give it with the introductory remarks.

'That Job Scott fully believed in the incarnation and Divinity of Christ, and that there is no redemption or reconciliation, nor even power to do the will of God, but through his power and Divine influence, is manifest from the general tenor of his writings, as will appear by the following extracts from them.'

"The Jews, even while they were expecting Christ's coming, knew him not when he came; they overlooked and despised his mean and ordinary appearance, thought he was Joseph's son, and born among them, and so rejected, abused, and finally put him to death. But they were mistaken in his pedigree: his descent was from heaven, and God, not Joseph, was his father.—Seeing the light and life of the holy Word which in the beginning was with God, and was God, hath enlightened every man that cometh into the world, and seeing, moreover, Christ Jesus hath tasted death for every man; how shall we escape if we neglect and reject so great salvation?—I remembered the account of Christ's agony, his sweating, as it were drops of blood, and crying out to his heavenly Father, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me.' I saw the propriety of his passing through this trying scene, and though he passed through his sufferings for our sakes, he being experimentally touched with a feeling of our infirmities and sufferings, not but that his omniscience as God, could see and behold it all without feeling it in a body of flesh); but as the brethren were partakers of flesh and blood, he willingly took part of the same, and in all the sufferings incident to the brethren in this life, &c."* "Abraham saw Christ's day, rejoiced in it, and came in degree into the life of it. He not only saw it, as then to come in greater fulness and glory; he knew it in himself; for when the Jews said to Christ, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? he did not escape their dilemma by telling them, Abraham foresaw his

* Scott's Journal, p. 11, 187, 169.

“ day afar off: that was not the thing he aimed at; but he
 “ came directly to the ever important point, to the very life of
 “ the matter; ‘ *Verily, verily I say unto you, before Abraham was*
 “ *I am.*’ John viii. 58. “ Not I was; for, as the holy Word
 “ (the same that appears in the heart), he is the Eternal [I] Am.
 “ Abraham knew and enjoyed him as such, as the life and
 “ substance of the new covenant.—There never was, nor can
 “ be, but one thing through all time, that the just could or
 “ ever can live by; that is, this inward word of life, the spiri-
 “ tual flesh and blood of Christ, *He that eateth me, even he shall*
 “ *live by me*, saith the blessed Jesus, John vi. 57, and he that
 “ eateth him not truly and substantially—has no life in him.
 “ This is the tree of life *in the midst of the paradise of God*: this
 “ heals the nations of them that walk in the light of the lamb;
 “ and by this, and this only, they live unto God.—Hence Paul
 “ renounces all mere legal righteousness, and comes home to
 “ Christ alive in his own soul. He mentions *the blessing of Abra-*
 “ *ham* as coming on the Gentiles only through *Jesus Christ the*
 “ *life.*” * “ I shall close my extracts from Job Scott with the
 “ following stanzas from his Journal:—

‘ Though storms without arise,
 ‘ Emblems of those within,
 ‘ On Christ my soul relies,
 ‘ The sacrifice for sin.

‘ And well assur’d I am,
 ‘ True peace is only known,
 ‘ Where he, the harmless Lamb,
 ‘ Has made the heart his throne.’ †

Is not this language scriptural? Does the sentiment that Jesus Christ the Eternal Word by whom the worlds were created, became man, like us in all things, sin excepted, approximate nearer to the heathen mythology than to Christianity?

Let us next examine those particular expressions of Job Scott’s in Ann Alexander’s letter, which make a birth of the divinity in man, (whereby we are made ‘ partakers of the divine nature,’) ‡ the only ‘ possible way of salvation;’ and whether the idea or sentiment conveyed by them ‘ confounds the essential, and ‘ never to be forgotten distinction between the creature and the ‘ Creator, and erroneously represents the religious or spiritually-minded man, as homogeneous with Divinity.’ Whether ‘ it

* Scott on Baptism, 8vo Edit. p. 151, 154.

† Some Tracts, &c. p. 29—31.

‡ 2 Pet. i. 4.

‘is with respect to the intellectual world, the exact counterpart of the doctrine of Spinoza [a systematic atheist]* respecting the material world.’†

‘It is altogether clear to my mind,’ says Job Scott, ‘that that one Divinity actually became the seed of the woman, and bruised the serpent’s head, as early as any man ever witnessed redemption from sin.’ And further on, ‘My only hope of salvation is on this ground, nor do I believe there has been any other possible way of salvation, but that of a real conception and birth of the Divinity in man.’

These expressions are succeeded in the ‘Sequel’ by the following interrogations.

‘May we not reverently ask, how is it possible for the Divinity to become the seed of a woman?’ How possible! By its own omnipotent power. ‘On what ground shall we admit a proposition so irrational, unsuitable, and degrading, as that there can possibly be a real conception and birth of that *uncreated, self-existent, and eternal* Divinity, in man. In what part of the scripture is this doctrine, so widely remote from the beautiful simplicity of the gospel, and so evidently resembling the mythology of the heathens, to be found?’‡

Does this language indicate a candid, liberal mind, disposed to put a fair construction on the words of a man, it acknowledges to be ‘in an eminent degree virtuous?’ Is not Verax intentionally confounding here, what in another place he has as carefully distinguished, when he had a different object in view; namely ‘*Christ as a principle*’ of life, and the soul in which he dwells: his words are ‘I apprehend it was the *oneness* of this principle *with God*, which our early friends *alone* considered as properly *divine*, and an *object of worship*.’§ He further observes upon this principle of theirs, that ‘it must surely have been their intention to ascribe Supreme Divinity to God the Father only, the uncreated cause of all things.’ Yet because Job Scott has expressed the same sentiment as our early friends, Deist is too mild an appellation for him, he must be compared with an Atheist.

Whence is this inconsistency in Verax? Does he believe that J. Scott could possibly mean by a birth of the Divinity in man, that each regenerate man contained within himself *the uncreated, self-existent, and eternal Divinity*? no, it is a sentiment too blasphemous, unworthy of himself, and contradictory to his other

* Verax makes this atheist to be in an eminent degree a serious and strictly virtuous man!!! O tempora!

† Sequel, p. 100, 101.

‡ Ibid. p. 100.

§ Vindication, p. v.

writings, for Verax to have seriously entertained for a moment. He also allows presently afterwards that when J. S. speaks of the Divinity being 'one in the head and in all the members,' 'a difference in degree' may be understood. Does not this confession undermine the whole charge? For what makes the Divine attributes the exclusive attributes of God, whether we regard his power, wisdom, or goodness, but our attaching the idea of infinity to them. Thus to ascribe infinite power, wisdom, and goodness to the creature, would be to confound it with the Creator; but no one will say that because a man participates of a portion of the Divine power, wisdom, and goodness, he therefore possesses the incommunicable attributes of Deity, nevertheless, as these properties are Divine in their nature, proceeding from God, in whom *alone* they *essentially* exist, he may be said to possess a measure of the Divinity of Christ, his God and Saviour; through whose regenerating, baptizing power he has recovered the image and likeness of God, which the first Adam lost, the day of his transgression. To doubt that God out of his fulness can communicate of his perfections to finite beings, is to doubt his omnipotence.

'The religious or spiritually-minded man,' so far from ascribing any Divine virtue or power to himself, will from an experimental sense of his own insufficiency readily concede to the truth of that declaration of Christ's, 'Without me ye can 'do nothing.' A lesson unlearned by our men of reason, who think themselves equal to the performance of their whole duty by their natural powers, without the aid of Divine influence; for viewing Christianity merely as a system of ethics, the doctrine of the New Birth, or a renovation of all the powers of the soul by the baptism of the Holy Spirit, must appear to them unintelligible: by such the expressions of Job Scott may be viewed as 'irrational, unsuitable, and degrading,' but the language of Christ and his apostles will, upon the same principles be equally liable to censure, since they enforce in the most impressive language the doctrine of the New Birth, as essential to salvation. Our Saviour addressing Nicodemus, introduces it with 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born 'again, he cannot see the kingdom of God:' notwithstanding Nicodemus was a teacher or rabbi in Israel, his learning could not comprehend this doctrine, Christ however, knowing his sincerity, condescends to explain more fully his meaning, 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water 'and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. 'That which is born of the flesh, is flesh; and that which is 'born of the Spirit, is Spirit.*

That which is born of the flesh must partake of its nature and properties, and is therefore called flesh: so also that which is born of the Spirit, must be begotten into the same nature, our Lord therefore calls it Spirit, which Spirit is Christ in us the hope of glory. Hence how far transcendent the union between Christ and his disciples, beyond the closest connexion, the purest friendship between man and man! It is not a union originating in a human affection, but a spiritual and vital union, from the fulness of the Godhead or Divinity in Christ the head, diffusing its living virtue to all the members of his mystical body. This ‘bond of unity’ which ‘the spiritually-minded ‘man’ feels *even in this life*, is very forcibly represented by our Lord, in his comparison between himself and his church, and the vine and its branches: ‘Abide in me, and I in you. As ‘the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the ‘vine: no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ‘ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the ‘same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do ‘nothing.’* John xv. 4, 5.

* This and the text that follows, are among those passages in Scripture, to elucidate which, the attempts of the man of mere critical skill and learning will fail—it is out of his province—here the simple, illiterate, spiritually-minded Christian is more learned than he: his heart is warmed and animated by them, the Spirit of Christ bearing witness with his spirit to the spiritual truth signified: whilst the critic amuses himself with them as highly figurative forms of speech, and sticking in the letter, like the carnal Jews of old, reaps nothing from them but husks or chaff: forgetting, or not heeding the words of our Lord to the unbelieving Jews, ‘It is the spirit that quickeneth, the ‘flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.’ John vi. 63. A dignitary of the church of England, whom I esteem for his talents, and of whose learned labours I have availed myself, has even ventured so far to contradict the doctrines of his own church, as to say, ‘If any one asks what the expressions in scripture, *Regenerate,—Born of the Spirit,—New Creatures*, ‘mean?—We answer, that they mean nothing! nothing to us!—nothing to be found, or sought for, in the present circumstances of ‘Christianity!’ Does not this lamentably exhibit the little avail the greatest abilities and learning are of to their possessor, unless he also possesses with them the life of God in his soul? The doctrine contained in the expressions with which this writer informs us we have nothing to do, is no other than that Rock upon which Christ said he would build his church, and that the gates of hell should never prevail against it. That its enemies should find allies in any professing themselves members of the Society of Friends is a phenomenon, that marks the fatal progress of a lifeless profession of Christianity in the present age.

A late eminently pious writer of the Church of England, has, with an energy of reasoning peculiar to himself, described the danger at-

It is to this principle of the Divine life in man, here compared to the sap of the vine, that our Lord points, when he says, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and

tending a representation of what the Scriptures say on the doctrine of the new Birth, as being only strong figurative expressions, implying no more at most than an outward moral change of behaviour, and he also at the same time, shows from the words of our Lord, John xv. 4, 5. the absolute necessity of the new Birth, and that by rejecting it, we reject what is essential to our salvation. The subject is so momentous, that I shall adopt his words on this occasion.

'How pitiable, or rather how hurtful, is that learning, which uses all its art of words, to avoid and lose the true sense of our Saviour's doctrine concerning the new Birth, which is necessary to fallen man, by holding that the passages asserting the new Birth are only a *figurative*, strong form of words concerning *something* that is not *really* a birth or growth of the new Nature, but may, according to the best rules of criticism, signify either our entrance into the society of Christians by the rite of baptism, or such a new relation as a scholar may have with his master, who by a conformity to terms of union, or by copying his ways and manners, may, by a *figure of speech*, be said to be born again of him. Now let it here be observed, that no passage of scripture is to be called or esteemed as a figurative expression, but when the literal meaning cannot be allowed, as implying something that is either bad in itself or impossible, or inconsistent with some plain and undeniable doctrines of scripture. Now that this is not the case here is very evident. For who will presume to say, that for the soul of fallen man to be born again of the Son, or light, and holy Spirit of God, is in the literal sense of the words a thing bad in itself, or impossible, or inconsistent with any plain and undeniable doctrines of Scriptures? The critics therefore, who in this matter leave the literal meaning of the words, and have recourse to a figurative sense, are without excuse, and have nothing they can urge as a reason for so doing, but their own skill in words. One would wonder how any persons, that believe the great mystery of our redemption, who adore the divine goodness, in that the Son of God became a man himself, in order to make it possible for man by a birth from him to enter again into the kingdom of God, should seek to, and contend for, not a *real*, but a figurative sense of a new birth in Jesus Christ. Can any thing strike more directly at the heart of the whole nature of our redemption? God became man. But why was this done? It was because man was become so dead to the kingdom of heaven, unable to help himself, because that which he had lost was the light and life of heaven; that the Son or Word of God, entered by a birth into this fallen nature, that by this mysterious incarnation, the fallen nature might be born again of him according to the *Spirit*, in the *same reality*, as they were born of Adam according to the *flesh*. But what becomes of this, what is there left in any part of the mystery, if this new birth, for the sake of which God became man, is not, as the scripture affirms, a real birth of the Son and Spirit of God in the soul,

‘ drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.—He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven—he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.’*

This is the same doctrine as that contained in the exhortation of the apostle to the Corinthians. ‘ Examine yourselves,—prove your own selves: know ye not your own selves how that Jesus Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?’† It was a

but something or other, which the critics say, may be called a new Birth by a certain figure of speech? Is not this to give up all our redemption at once, and a turning all the mysteries of our salvation, into mere empty, unmeaning terms of speech? For this new Birth is not a *part*, but the *whole* of our salvation. Nothing does us any good, but either as it helps forward our Regeneration, or as it is a true fruit or effect of it. All the glad tidings of the Gospel, all the benefits of our Saviour, however variously expressed in scripture, all centre in this one point, that he is become our light, our life, our holiness and salvation; that we are in him new Creatures, created again unto righteousness, born again of him, from above, of the Spirit of God. Every thing in the Gospel is for the sake of this new Creature, this new Man in Christ Jesus, and nothing is regarded without it. What excuse therefore can be made for that learning, which, robbing us of the true fruits of the tree of life, leaves us nothing to feed upon but the dry dust of words?

“ I am the vine, ye are the branches.” ‘ Here Christ, our second Adam, uses this similitude to teach us, that the new Birth that we are to have from him is *real*, in the most strict and literal sense of the word, and that there is the same nearness of relation between him and his true disciples, that there is between the vine and its branches, that he does all that in us and for us, which the vine does to its branches. Now the life of the vine must be really derived into the branches, they cannot be branches till the birth of the vine is brought forth in them. And therefore as sure as the birth of the vine must be brought forth in the branches, so sure is it that we must be born again of our second Adam; and that unless the life of the Holy Jesus be in us by a birth from him, we are as dead to him, and the kingdom of God, as the branch is dead to the vine from which it is broken off. Again our blessed Saviour says, “ Without me ye can do nothing.” The question is, When or how a man may be said to be without Christ? Consider again the vine and its branches: a branch can then only be said to be without the vine, when the vegetable life of the vine is no longer in it. This is the only sense in which we can be said to be without Christ; when he is no longer in us, as a principle of a heavenly life, we are then without him, and so can do nothing, that is, nothing that is good or holy. A Christ not in us, is the same thing as a Christ not ours.’

* John vi. 53—58.

† 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

doctrine too closely connected with the life of Christianity, for the primitive Christians to have been strangers to it, hence the apostle's appeal to them, '*Know ye not your own selves,*' &c. Again, '*Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory.*'* This the apostle Paul says is the mystery that he preached to the Gentiles, namely, '*Christ in you, the hope of glory.*' In his epistle to the Ephesians, he further says, '*For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith—that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.*' Again in the same epistle, '*And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets, &c. for the perfecting of the saints,—till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.*'† The apostle Peter also in his general epistle to believers, addresses them as '*being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever.*'‡

More scriptures to the same effect might be cited, but these will explain 'the plain and genuine meaning of Job Scott,' and are an answer to the question, 'In what part of the Scripture is this doctrine—to be found?'

Perhaps I am one of those whom Verax terms *superficial readers* of the Scriptures; if so, I must allege in their defence, that they do not think, as he represents, that these passages of Scripture, or others of like import, favour the idea 'that the same Divinity which is imputed to Christ, is also imputable to every pious and upright man.' Although, to a verbal critic some of them may seem as objectionable as the words of Job Scott. This charge against him and his friends is not very dissimilar to a gross calumny against our early Friends, that they believed each individual contained the whole and entire Christ within himself. The following words of J. Penington will be a confutation of both.

'There is a difference between the light which enlighteneth (the fulness of light, which giveth the measure of light, the measure of anointing to us), and the measure, or proportion which is given; the one is Christ himself, the other is his gift; yet his gift is of the same nature with himself, and leavens those that receive it, and abide in it, into the same nature.' (See p. 95.)

Is this confounding 'the essential and never to be forgotten distinction between the creature and the CREATOR?' Is it

* Col. iii. 2, 3, 4. † Eph. iii. 14—19. iv. 11—13. ‡ 1 Pet. i. 23.

‘with respect to the intellectual world, the exact counterpart of the doctrine of Spinoza, respecting the material world?’ Can it be called indulging ‘in the fallies of imagination,’ or deviating from ‘the sober and simple path of [right] reason and revelation?’*

Let the idolizers of *human* reason seriously and calmly consider whom they are opposing, lest they bring upon themselves the charge contained in the martyr Stephen’s Address to the Jews, ‘Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost, as your fathers did, so do ye.’†

What affinity there was between the sentiments of Job Scott and Plato, I am not sufficiently acquainted with the works of the latter to determine. From the accounts I have read of Plato, he seems to have borrowed his philosophy from the Hebrew theology, hence he has been denominated the Hebrew philosopher. Numenius the Pythagorean calls him the Attic Moses, and upbraids him with plagiarism, because he stole his doctrine about the world and God, from the books of Moses. There may therefore be an affinity between some of the sentiments Plato has borrowed from the sacred writings, and the doctrines of Christianity: but does it follow that the latter is indebted to the former for any of its doctrines? Neither do I see why Job Scott should be suspected of having borrowed from the writings of a heathen philosopher: his Journal and Treatise on Baptism contain nothing to justify the injurious comparison. (The Scriptures I have quoted, inform us whence Job Scott derived his idea of the divine union and oneness between Christ and his church, without recurring to Plato, or to the heathen mythology.

Finally, nothing can be a more unexceptionable illustration of the union of the spiritually-minded man with the Divinity, than the divinely instructive prayer of our Lord, previously to his sufferings and death.

‘And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. I have manifested thy name unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world.—For I have given unto them the words which thou gavest me: and they have received them, and have known surely that I came out from thee, and they have believed that thou didst send me. I pray for them: I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me, for they are thine. And all mine are thine, and thine are mine, and I am glorified in them.—Holy Father, keep through thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be one as we are.—’

* Sequel, p. 101.

† Acts vii. 51.

' Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall
 ' believe on me through their word. That they all may be one,
 ' as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee ; that they also may be
 ' one in us ; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.
 ' And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them ; that
 ' they may be one, even as we are one. I in them, and thou in
 ' me, that they may be made perfect in one, and that the
 ' world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them,
 ' as thou hast loved me. Father, I will that they also whom
 ' thou hast given me, be with me where I am ; that they
 ' may behold my glory which thou hast given me ; for thou
 ' lovedst me before the foundation of the world. O righteous
 ' Father, the world hath not known thee ; but I have known
 ' thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me. And I
 ' have declared unto them thy name, and will declare it : that
 ' the love wherewith thou hast loved me, may be in them, and
 ' I in them.*

* John xvii. 5—26.

CHAP. X.

A continuation of the same subject—On the Miracles of Christ.—Some objections to the late proceedings of the Society of FRIENDS in England answered.

THE same metaphysical subtilty with which H. B. explains her views of the subjects of the three preceding articles of accusation, attends her explanation of her sentiments on the fourth and last, *the miracles of Christ*; the same caution was therefore observed in wording it, as in that with which it is combined.

‘ It further appears, that she is not one with Friends in her belief respecting *various parts* of the New Testament; particularly relating to the miraculous conception and *miracles of Christ*.’

Upon this part of the charge Verax observes, ‘ That the real nature and extent of this charge may be better understood, the official reply of the clerk of the morning meeting should be related; the party accused urging, that if they intended to charge her with denying the facts recorded in the New Testament,’ “ They had nothing in justice to ground it upon,” ‘ the clerk observed,’ “ We have not charged thee with disbelieving any part of the New Testament, but only with differing in thy belief from the Society: look at the charge, and observe how it is worded.” ‘ On her enquiring into the difference, he undertook to define it, by asserting,’ “ That Friends, as a Society, acknowledged their full and entire belief of all that was written, relative to those facts, in the New Testament, and she would not.” “ I told them, as I had done the committee, that I did not call them in question; but fully believed in the divine power and right to produce those effects,

“ or even greater, in that, or any other age of the world; but
 “ as historic facts, readily confessed my ignorance, as to their
 “ positive and literal certainty; and queried whether it was
 “ possible for any of them, in strict truth to assert, that they
 “ knew any more about them. And whether the advantages
 “ resulting to us as individuals, from a belief of the self-evident
 “ doctrines, and imitation of the correspondent example, of
 “ Jesus Christ, as they are stated in the New Testament, could
 “ be supposed in any degree positively to depend upon our
 “ certain knowledge of these facts.”* To the committee H. B.
 expressed herself on miracles to this import, ‘ That Christ might
 ‘ have wrought them, they were recorded as historic facts—if
 ‘ she had been present she would have told what she thought
 ‘ respecting them, but as she was not present she could not say
 ‘ whether they were wrought or not.’

If this language does not extend to an open denial of the miracles recorded by the evangelists, it clearly implies that H. B. rejected the evidence upon which they are received, as insufficient to command our belief of them. Deists and infidels have endeavoured to justify their scepticism upon the same principles. The fallacy of their reasoning has been repeatedly exposed.—Watson, in answer to Gibbon the historian, on the miracles of Christ, says,—

‘ Knowledge is rightly divided by Mr. Locke into intuitive, sensitive, and demonstrative. It is clear that a past miracle can neither be the object of sense, nor of intuition, nor consequently of demonstration;—we cannot then philosophically speaking, be said to know, that a miracle has ever been performed. But in all the great concerns of life, we are influenced by probability rather than by knowledge: and of probability, the same great author establishes two foundations; a conformity to our own experience, and the testimony of others. Now it is contended, that by the opposition of these two principles, probability is destroyed; or, in other terms, that human testimony can never influence the mind to assent to a proposition repugnant to uniform experience. Whose experience do you mean? You will not say your own; for the experience of an individual reaches but a little way; and no doubt, you daily assent to a thousand truths in politics, in physics, and in the business of common life, which you have never seen verified by experience. You will not produce the experience of your friends, for that can extend itself but a little way beyond your own. But by uniform experience, I conceive, you are desirous of understanding the experience of all ages and nations, since the foundation of the world. I answer, first; how

' is it that you become acquainted with the experience of all
 ' ages and nations? You will reply, from history. Be it so:
 ' Peruse then by far the most ancient records of antiquity; and
 ' if you find no mention of miracles in them, I give up the
 ' point. Yes;—but every thing related therein respecting mi-
 ' racles, is to be reckoned fabulous.—Why?—Because miracles
 ' contradict the experience of all ages and nations. Do you
 ' not perceive, Sir, that you beg the very question in debate?
 ' for we affirm, that the great and learned nation of Egypt,
 ' that the Heathen inhabiting the land of Canaan, that the
 ' numerous people of the Jews, and the nations which, for ages,
 ' surrounded them, have all had great experience of miracles.
 ' You cannot otherwise obviate this conclusion, than by ques-
 ' tioning the authenticity of that book, concerning which, New-
 ' ton, when he was writing his Commentary on Daniel, ex-
 ' pressed himself to the person from whom I have the anecdote,
 ' and which deserves not to be lost: "I find more sure marks
 ' of authenticity in the Bible, than in any profane history what-
 ' soever."*

This is a sufficient answer to H. B.'s objection to give her
 assent to the truth of the miracles of Christ, because she was not
 present when they were transacted or wrought, and therefore
 could know them only through the report of others; as to the
 plea she made, that they were not revealed to her mind, it will
 be no excuse for not believing them, since, as Barclay observes,
 the Spirit of God would lead the mind to believe them, if it
 were not resisted, and to resist his Spirit, is to sin against God.

In my letter to John Evans, page 8. I have said, ' With re-
 ' spect to the miracles recorded by the evangelists, if they were
 ' not true, then those accounts, in which they are so inter-
 ' woven with the rest of the narrative, as to be inseparable,
 ' must be considered as impositions on mankind; the conse-
 ' quence is unavoidable.' These expressions may appear strong,
 but Watson has said as much in his *Apology for Christianity*; his
 words are,—

' The miracles recorded in the Old and New Testament are
 ' so intimately united with the narration of common events,
 ' and the ordinary transactions of life, that you cannot, as in
 ' profane history, separate the one from the other. My mean-
 ' ing will be illustrated by an instance. Tacitus and Suetonius
 ' have handed down to us an account of many great actions
 ' performed by Vespasian; amongst the rest, they inform us of
 ' his having wrought some miracles, of his having cured a lame
 ' man, and restored sight to one that was blind. But what they
 ' tell us of these miracles, is so unconnected with every thing

* Watson's *Apology for Christianity*, 6th Edit. p. 82 to 85.

‘ that goes before and after, that you may reject the relation of
 ‘ them without injuring, in any degree, the consistency of the
 ‘ narration of the other circumstances of his life : on the other
 ‘ hand, if you reject the relation of the miracles said to be per-
 ‘ formed by Christ, you must necessarily reject the account of
 ‘ his whole life, and of several transactions, concerning which
 ‘ we have the undoubted testimony of other writers, besides the
 ‘ evangelists.’*

If a positive *disbelief* of the miracles of Christ produce this effect on the mind, *doubts* respecting them will, in degree, be productive of similar effects, inducing us to question the truth of the gospel of Christ, as preached by the divinely commissioned apostles, rather than sincerely to believe, and cordially to embrace it. That this has been their unhappy tendency on the mind of H. B. will appear from what she told the committee of the morning meeting, to which she acknowledged ‘ that the
 ‘ death of Christ was of no more use to us than the death of
 ‘ many of the martyrs whose exemplary lives left a favour be-
 ‘ hind them.’ On her being asked ‘ whether from the
 ‘ writings of the apostles, and his own testimony, there was not
 ‘ ground to believe, his coming answered a more extensive pur-
 ‘ pose than his mere outward example? the testimony of John
 ‘ the Baptist for instance, “Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh
 ‘ away the sin of the world.” John i. 29. Isa. liii. 7. and
 ‘ many other written evidences in confirmation of what they
 ‘ were earnestly desirous she might be sensible of,’ she said,
 ‘ The writings of the Apostles, or indeed the Scriptures were
 ‘ of no more importance to her than any other book that con-
 ‘ veyed instruction to her mind, that there were parts of the
 ‘ writings of the apostles she did not agree with, particularly
 ‘ those parts wherein the atonement is mentioned,’ &c.

In the *Appeal* it is intimated that some of the recorded miracles do not harmonize ‘ with the benevolent spirit of the
 ‘ gospel.’ We are not however informed which of the miracles are of this description: neither does H. B. appear to have objected to miracles, because they were of this description. For the miracle by which our Saviour fed the multitude in the wilderness, although it must be allowed to harmonize with the benevolent spirit of the gospel, yet its tendency was insufficient to stamp it as a truth on the mind of H. B. or even shelter a belief of it from ridicule, for upon one of the committee of the morning meeting having expressed a full persuasion that the miracle had been wrought, she replied, ‘ And what has thy
 ‘ belief done for thee, canst thou go and do likewise?’

* Watson’s Apology for Christianity, 6th Edit. p. 75, 76.

The *Appeal* likewise has this enquiry, ‘Are the circumstances or the time and occasion of their [the miracles] being all performed, related by the evangelists, in a manner consistent with each other?’ It is generally admitted that the evangelists have not observed an exact chronological order, in their relation of some of the incidents in the life of Christ, and the brevity with which one evangelist describes a transaction more particularly related by another, may sometimes occasion an apparent difference between them, but these are of that trivial nature that, although they may claim the attention of the critic, they will never be considered, by an unbiassed mind, as affecting the truth of the leading features of the transactions themselves.

‘I know not,’ says Paley, ‘a more rash or unphilosophical conduct of the understanding, than to reject the substance of a story, by reason of some diversity in the circumstances with which it is related. The usual character of human testimony is substantial truth under circumstantial variety. This is what the daily experience of courts of justice teaches. When accounts of a transaction come from the mouths of different witnesses, it is seldom that it is not possible to pick out apparent, or real inconsistencies between them. These inconsistencies are studiously displayed by an adverse pleader, but oftentimes with little impression upon the minds of the judges. On the contrary, a close and minute agreement induces the suspicion of confederacy and fraud. When written histories touch upon the same scenes of action, the comparison almost always affords ground for a like reflection. Numerous, and sometimes important, variations present themselves; not seldom also, absolute and final contradictions; yet neither one nor the other are deemed sufficient to shake the credibility of the main fact.’ Paley confirms these remarks by comparing profane authors who have related the same transactions, with each other, and then proceeds; ‘A great deal of the discrepancy observable in the gospels, arises from *omission*; from a fact or a passage of Christ’s life being noticed by one writer, which is unnoticed by another. Now omission is at all times a very uncertain ground of objection. We perceive it not only in the comparison of different writers, but even in the same writer, when compared with himself.’ After observing that the histories of Josephus, Suetonius, Tacitus, and Dio Cassius, contain instances that prove the truth of this observation, Paley continues, ‘But these discrepancies will be still more numerous, when men do not write histories but *memoirs*; which is perhaps the true name and proper description of our gospels; that is, when they do not undertake, or ever meant to deliver, in order of time, a regular and complete account of

‘all the things of importance, which the person, who is the subject of their history, did or said; but only, out of many similar ones, to give such passages, or such actions and discourses, as offered themselves more immediately to their attention,—or were suggested by their *particular design* at the time of writing.’*

Hannah Barnard rejected the historical evidence for the miracles of Christ, because they had not been revealed to her mind by immediate revelation. Having thus set aside the only evidences by which the miracles could be assured to the mind, if she retained any belief that our Saviour wrought miracles, it must have been a belief without any evidence. With regard to the resurrection of Christ’s body from the grave, she unequivocally expressed her disbelief of his bodily appearance to his disciples, and this necessarily involves in it a disbelief of his resurrection, and consequently a disbelief of the most important miracle recorded in the Gospels; for if Christ were not risen from the dead, as Paul justly observes, the apostles were false witnesses of God, and instead of being considered as divinely commissioned messengers and ministers of God, they must be rejected as impostors who had forged a lie in his name, to give a sanction to their particular dogmas. The substance of the conversation between H. Barnard and himself on this point is thus described by F. Smith.

‘She asked me, “When she had denied the resurrection? a circumstance she as fully believed as any of the doctrines of Christ,” I answered “in the Committee,” she said, “I certainly was mistaken; she never had denied it.” On which I reminded her, that a friend had asked her the question; to which she answered in the affirmative; but being further asked, whether he appeared corporeally, when they were all together? she answered, How could that be *when the doors were shut*. At this time she said to me, “Aye, how could he indeed?” To which I answered somewhat as a friend had done in the Committee, “If thou recollect the relation as in Scripture, thou must be aware that this circumstance was an extraordinary appeal to the faith of the disciples; that Thomas had previously expressed his disbelief of the resurrection by saying, “I will not believe, unless I see the print of the nails in his hands, and the hole in his side;” that at this period, Thomas was the person addressed, “Reach hither thy finger,” said Christ, “and behold my hands, and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing.” On which Thomas made use of these memorable words, “My Lord and my God,”

* Paley’s Evidences, 7th Edit. Vol. II. p. 289,—294.

‘ wherein he acknowledged not only his power but his Divinity
 ‘ also.—“ Well,” said she, “ then thou must consider me like
 ‘ Thomas, for I cannot believe it ; I believe he might have ap-
 ‘ peared spiritually but not corporeally.” I then referred to
 ‘ another part, wherein he appealed to their understandings, by
 ‘ thus addressing his disciples, “ Behold my hands and my feet,
 ‘ that it is I myself ; handle me and see ; for a spirit hath not
 ‘ flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” And that he took “ a
 ‘ piece of a broiled fish and of an honey-comb,” “ to all which she
 ‘ said, “ it made no difference to her, she did not believe it.”

How this part of the conversation between H. B. and F. Smith came to be omitted in the account given of it in the *Sequel*, will, probably, never be satisfactorily explained, since the part of the conversation which is inserted in that work is misrepresented.

Has not Hannah Barnard by rejecting the relations of Christ’s appearances to his disciples after his resurrection, rejected the only proof we have of the reality of his resurrection? and is not this speaking ‘ against the validity of Christ’s—*resur-*
 ‘ *rection**, ascension, and glory in the heavens, according as they
 ‘ are set forth in the Scriptures?’ and has she not hereby made herself amenable to the rule cited in page 203, which enjoins,

* David Hume’s insinuation that the scripture miracles were no other than pious frauds, related ‘ with the best intention in the world, for the
 ‘ sake of promoting so holy a cause,’ is thus animadverted upon by George Campbell.

‘ Some of the miraculous events, which the Apostles attested, were
 ‘ not only the *evidences*, but the distinguishing *doctrines* of the religion
 ‘ which they taught. There is therefore in their case an absolute in-
 ‘ consistency betwixt a conviction of the truth of the cause, and the
 ‘ consciousness of the frauds used in support of it. Those frauds them-
 ‘ selves, if I may so express myself, constituted the very essence of the
 ‘ cause. What were the tenets, by which they were distinguished, in
 ‘ their religious system, particularly from the Pharisees, who owned
 ‘ not only the unity and perfections of the Godhead, the existence of
 ‘ angels and demons, but the general resurrection, and a future state of
 ‘ rewards and punishments? Were not these their peculiar tenets,
 ‘ That Jesus, whom the Jews and Romans joined in crucifying with-
 ‘ out the gates of Jerusalem, had suffered that ignominious death, to
 ‘ make atonement for the sins of men? that, in testimony of this, and
 ‘ of the divine acceptance, God had raised him from the dead? that
 ‘ he had exalted him to his own right hand, to be a prince and saviour,
 ‘ to give repentance to the people and the remission of their sins? that
 ‘ he is now our advocate with the Father? that he will descend from
 ‘ heaven at the last day, to judge the world in righteousness, and to
 ‘ receive his faithful disciples into heaven, to be for ever with himself.”

in case ‘ any shall wilfully persist in error, in point of faith, after
 ‘ being duly informed,’ that then such be dealt with ‘ accord-
 ‘ ing to gospel order; that the truth, church, or body of Christ,
 ‘ may not suffer by any particular pretended member that is so
 ‘ corrupt?’

The *Appeal* contains the following questions, on the Society of Friends requiring of H. B. a belief of the miracles recorded in the New Testament: ‘ If the Society have ever professed so large
 ‘ an article of faith, have they given it forth with the requisite
 ‘ publicity, to render it a well-known condition of Christian
 ‘ communion? or, is a formal and positive assent to it, a belief
 ‘ with the heart, and confession with the mouth, more especially
 ‘ necessary, as a qualification for approved ministers of the
 ‘ Gospel? And has such a test been actually proposed by the
 ‘ Society, and acceded to, by either its members in general, or
 ‘ its ministers? Was it insisted upon, as an essential point, in the
 ‘ first age of the Society? If not, when was it introduced? Can
 ‘ any instance be produced previous to the present?’*

Has not R. Barclay, in the 5th and 6th Proposition, § 15, of his Apology, insisted upon a belief of the *birth, miracles, and resurrection* of Christ as essential to those who have the knowledge of the Scriptures? And that the Society have, by the most extensive distribution of this book, given forth their belief of these points with the requisite publicity, cannot be denied by Verax. Has not W. Penn also, in his *Address to Protestants* (quoted page 149) declared a belief of the *miracles and resurrection* of Christ, an important part of the Christian creed? And are not Barclay and Penn introduced to our notice by Verax as exhibiting the doctrines believed by the Friends, in the first age of the Society?

That our first Friends, did not require any formal subscription to Articles of Faith, can prove nothing in favour of Verax; for might we not with as much propriety hence infer, that they did not consider faith in God and Christ necessary to qualify for membership with them, as to make a similar inference with respect to the miracles and resurrection of Christ? yet Verax would not admit it to be candid or just to accuse them of having fellowship with Atheists and Deists.

The rule of the year 1694, I allow to be *virtually* an answer

‘ These fundamental articles of their system, they must have known,
 ‘ deserved no better appellation than a string of lies, if we suppose
 ‘ them liars in the testimony they gave of the resurrection and ascen-
 ‘ sion of their master.’ *Dissertation on Miracles*. 3d Edit. 1797, p.
 137, 138.

* *Appeal*, p. 96.

to any objection of this sort ; so is also the paper published by the Society the preceding year, and the quotations adduced in this work from Penn, Barclay, Fox, and Penington. But I believe it will be impossible for Verax to mention a single instance wherein the rule of 1694 has been proposed as a test of communion to any person applying for admission into the Society of Friends. To ascertain the cause of which, is not difficult, the rule never being intended as a test for admission into the Society, but to prevent those who were already members of it from rejecting the reality of Christ's sufferings, &c. As a test of communion, it is not of itself sufficiently explicit, since it does not enjoin any faith in God the Creator of all things, except by inference, that the belief of the heavenly man Christ includes a belief of his two-fold nature as being God and man ; but this inference (however just) we may suppose Verax would not admit.

Before we examine the quotations adduced by Verax from the writings of our early Friends, to prove that they did not consider 'an outward conformity of sentiment' on the miracles of Christ, 'as a proper bond of religious soundness in the faith,' it will be proper first to advert to the distinction made by H. Barnard between the *doctrinal truths* and *historic facts* contained in the Scriptures. She uniformly insisted on the non-essentiality of a belief of the historic facts recorded by the evangelists, and on the impropriety of enforcing or requiring such a belief as a condition of Christian communion ; which, she said, should be confined to *essential doctrinal truths* : hence she refused to acknowledge her belief of the resurrection of Christ from the grave, because (according to her) it partakes of the uncertainty, she attaches to historic facts in general, and more particularly to those of the miraculous kind.

We read in the gospels that Jesus Christ was born in the time of Augustus Cæsar, that he proved himself to be Messiah by a chain of miracles wrought before his bitterest enemies with that publicity that they could not be gainsaid ; that he was, through the malice and envy of the Jews, crucified, when Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judea, and that on the third day he rose from the dead, and appeared to his disciples for the space of forty days. These are all unquestionably *historic facts*. I do not say that H. B. entirely rejects the whole of them : but however true they may be in themselves, a belief of them ought not (agreeably to her position) to be made a condition of Christian communion. That a belief of them is not essential to the salvation of those who have never been favoured with the outward knowledge of the Scriptures, the only medium through which they are usually revealed to men, is granted, and is what

Barclay's Letter to Paets enforces; but this is quite foreign to our present enquiry, which does not relate to those who have not, but to those who have, the light afforded by the Scriptures. To say that a belief of historic facts is not essential to outward religious fellowship among the latter, is no other than saying that an acknowledgment of Christ as the Messiah foretold by the prophets, is not essential to an outward profession of Christianity. For must we not believe there was such a person as Jesus Christ, which is an *historic fact*, before we can believe him to be Messiah? Are not the bounds of religious union pleaded for by H. B. sufficiently expansive to comprehend the Deist?

What H. B. intends by 'the self-evident doctrines and corresponding example of Jesus Christ, as they are stated in the 'New Testament' does not clearly appear, but I am ready to think they are no more than what Rousseau would have acknowledged to be worthy of belief and imitation. But although this eminent Deist in his parallel between Jesus Christ and Socrates, could, when describing the former, admire the gentleness and purity of his manners, the mildness and affecting grace of his instructions, the elevation and dignity of his maxims, the deep wisdom of his discourses, the 'pure and sublime 'morality that was inculcated in his instructions, and which he 'alone (adds Rousseau) taught and practised with an equal 'degree of perfection,' and by the irresistible force of truth is made to exclaim, 'Ah! if the life and death of Socrates carry 'the marks of a sage, the life and death of Jesus proclaim a 'God;' yet, strange inconsistency! this man after all, to apologize for his not believing in Christ as Messiah, pretends that the 'gospel is full of things that are incredible, of things which 'are repugnant to reason.' But the immorality of his life affords a more forcible, because a practical, reason for his infidelity.

If Rousseau had seen Evanston's *Dissonance of the Gospels*, he might have discovered that this work, very good naturedly, removes out of the way the foolishness of the gospel and the stone of stumbling to unbelievers; so that the Deist who makes his own fallible reason the standard by which he scrutinizes the ways and conduct of Omnipotence towards his creature man, may embrace it without first becoming a fool in his own eyes, and resigning his own earthly wisdom, which is from beneath, to be taught or instructed by the wisdom of God, revealed in his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ.

H. B.'s distinction between *essential doctrinal truths*, and *historic facts* likewise tends to promote an object so desirable to the Sceptic; but all attempts at such distinctions must fail of their purpose; since many of the historic facts of the gospel are so

closely interwoven with the peculiar doctrines of the Christian religion, that it is absurdity itself to think of separating them.

Our ancient Friend George Fox's sentiments on the miracles of Christ, are thus adverted to by Verax :—

‘ Although George Fox, in his Journal, which contains a great variety of his epistles, and other writings, is nearly, or wholly silent on the subject of the miracles of Christ and his apostles, no one acquainted with his character, would impute the omission to any doubt in his mind of their general authenticity.*

George Fox's epistles being chiefly addressed to Christian professors who believed the general authenticity of the miracles of Christ, he had little occasion to bring them prominently into view ; but when he addresses the Jews who did not believe them, he is not silent on the subject. In a paper called ‘ A Visitation to the Jews,’—he says,

‘ Now your fathers that had Moses,—and received the law from him ;—knew him [Christ] not, neither heard him, though he was a prophet,—made of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, but declared to be the Son of God, according to the Scriptures, by signs, wonders, and miracles, devils being made subject to him, loosing many from their chains, which were kept under bonds ; and yet your fathers believed not that prophet which Moses saw, and the prophets saw, &c.’†

In another paper, entitled ‘ A Declaration to the Jews, &c.’ he also says :—

‘ And did not David say, he would not suffer his Holy One to see corruption, nor leave his soul in hell ? he saw the travail of his soul, and therefore was satisfied, according to Isaiah's prophecy. Therefore after you had killed him by a shameful death upon the cross, and buried him, did not he rise again, and saw no corruption, whom neither death, bonds, nor grave could hold ?—who now remains in heaven at the right hand of God until the restitution of all things, who, after his resurrection, was seen of many brethren, and many witnesses, who were the witnesses of his resurrection amongst your forefathers, and amongst whom (your fathers) he wrought many miracles, and did many wonders, to the astonishment of the very heathen, and of many of your forefathers, yet their hearts being hardened, and their eyes being blinded, and could not nor would either see or believe, therefore did he pronounce the woes against you which are come upon you.’‡

* Appeal p. 97.

† Fox's Doctrinals, p. 36.

‡ Ibid. p. 245.

From the preceding extracts we see that G. Fox considered that the miracles wrought by Christ declared him to be the Son of God, and that the Jews' rejection of these proofs of his being the Messiah, was the cause of the woes he pronounced against them; and that the appearances of Christ to his disciples, after his resurrection, are also mentioned by G. Fox as evincing the truth of that greatest and most important of all the miracles recorded by the evangelists, and as qualifying the disciples to be the witnesses of it among the unbelieving Jews.

That the reader may judge of the value and importance attached to the sacred writings by G. Fox, I shall give one more extract, in which he declares his belief of them. It is from the paper presented to the governor of Barbadoes.

‘Concerning the Holy Scriptures, we believe that they were given forth by the Holy Spirit of God, through the holy men of God, who (as the Scripture itself declares, 2 Pet. i. 21.) “spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” We believe they are to be read, believed, and fulfilled (he that fulfils them is Christ), and they are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, &c. 2 Tim. iii. 16. and are able “to make wise unto salvation, through faith in Christ Jesus.” And we believe the Holy Scriptures are the words of God; for it is said in Exod. xx. 1. “God spoke all these words, saying, &c.” meaning the ten commandments given forth upon Mount Sinai. And in Rev. xxii. 18. saith John, “I testify to every man that heareth the *words* of the prophecy of this book; if any man addeth unto these, and if any man shall take away from the *words* of the book of this prophecy,” (not the *word*) &c. So in Luke i. 20. Because thou believest not my words.—So that we call the Holy Scriptures as Christ and the apostles called them—viz. the *words* of God.’*

Here G. Fox says in behalf of himself and his friends, that the Scriptures (including the writings of Moses and the first chapters of Luke) were given forth by divine inspiration, and are to be read and believed. We need no further evidence to prove that G. F. and H. B. are far from uniting in their views of both these positions; the latter entirely rejecting what is believed by the former, and published by him as the faith of the Society.

Of the several passages selected by Verax from Isaac Penington, the first is by far the most important both as to its length and contents. It is from a paper entitled, ‘A Question concerning Miracles answered.’ To obtain a clear and accurate view of the answer, we should be in possession of the purport of the question; it is rather long, but for the sake of perspicuity I shall insert the whole of it.

‘ Quest. If this be a new dispensation of the life and power
 ‘ of God, even of the preaching of the everlasting gospel again
 ‘ after the apostasy, why is it not accompanied with outward
 ‘ miracles now, as formerly it was? I say *outward* miracles, be-
 ‘ cause it is accompanied with inward miracles. For the lame
 ‘ (that could never set step in the path of life) do now walk; the
 ‘ eyes that were blind, are opened and do now see; the ears
 ‘ that were deaf, have been unstopped and do now hear; the
 ‘ lepers inwardly (who were all overspread with sin and cor-
 ‘ ruption) have been washed, cleansed, and healed, by the pure
 ‘ power; yea, the dead inwardly have been quickened, raised,
 ‘ turned to him that lives for evermore, have received life from
 ‘ him, and do live in him and with him. Now these are mighty
 ‘ things, wonderful miracles, even the substance of the miracles
 ‘ which were wrought under the law, and which Christ himself
 ‘ wrought outwardly. For it was not the outward healing,
 ‘ which is salvation, life, and power chiefly aimed at therein;
 ‘ but to point men by that to the thing which was to work the
 ‘ inward; that they might take notice of it, know it, come to
 ‘ it, and wait upon it, to be made partakers of the inward
 ‘ health and salvation by it. Yet seeing in that day Christ did
 ‘ then please to put forth his power outwardly, to point to, and
 ‘ witness of, the inward, why doth he not do so now?’

The objection raised by this question against the doctrine of special inspiration in the present age of Christianity, pre-supposes the truth of the evangelical accounts of the miracles of Christ, and I. Penington also by the manner in which he states the question, evidently accedes to it: that he had no doubt of their having been wrought, will yet further appear by his answer to this objection.

‘ Answ. *The nature of the present dispensation doth not require it.*
 ‘ For the present dispensation of life, is to bring men to the prin-
 ‘ ciple of life which is within them (which is the sum and sub-
 ‘ stance of all former dispensations); and to bring them to this,
 ‘ there doth not need any thing of a miraculous nature outward-
 ‘ ly; but the witness, demonstration, and enlightening of the
 ‘ Spirit inwardly. Now when the outward law was to be received,
 ‘ then the Lord saw need of outward miracles to confirm it; so also in
 ‘ the prophets’ days, while that dispensation held, till towards the
 ‘ coming of Christ: and when Christ came, in the body prepared
 ‘ by the Father, it pleased the Lord to confirm by outward
 ‘ visible demonstrations of his power in him, that this was he.
 ‘ Likewise afterwards, the apostles having the doctrine concerning
 ‘ that appearance to preach and testify to the world, the Lord was
 ‘ also pleased and saw good to confirm it by miracles. But now
 ‘ there is not any new doctrine to be preached. The doctrine
 ‘ concerning Christ is the same that it was, the very same that

‘ the apostles preached. Neither is there any need of confirming it now ; for it is generally believed among professors of all sorts ; as Christ’s birth, preaching, living holily, dying, offering himself up as a sacrifice for sin, rising, ascending, sitting at the right hand of the Father : who doubts of these things ? But under all this knowledge men hide their sins, their lusts, and corruptions, serving not the Lord,—but his enemies, and are become corrupt like unto the heathen.—’ Therefore hath the Lord visited the world in this state, and sent forth what he judged meet for it in this state ; to wit, not a ministry to preach over that doctrine, under which the Christian world had corrupted themselves ; but to point to the principle of life, wherein is the light and power to discover, lead from, and wash away this corruption. And with this ministry there goeth a power, to reach the heart and raise the witness in all that hear in fear, and in the sense and dread of God ; so that the witness presently answers, and the mind is inwardly satisfied, knows the thing, and turns to it. Now this (and the effect of this) is beyond miracles, and the satisfaction or assurance which they can afford. For miracles leave a dispute in the mind (notwithstanding all the miracles Christ showed, there was yet a dispute and dissatisfaction in the minds of many concerning him). But he that feels the thing itself in the true principle, where the demonstration and certainty of the Spirit’s assurance is received ; he is past dispute, and is gone a degree, in the nature of things, beyond that satisfaction which miracles can afford. He is out of that state and mind which asketh a sign, or seeketh confirmation by a sign. So that men ought to take heed how they expect or call for miracles now, as the Jews did to Christ for a sign of old ; for that is not the temper of mind which this dispensation is to answer, but rather to draw men out from thence into a principle, into the new life and Spirit itself ; where fuller demonstrations (of a deeper nature) are given to the soul, than outward miracles are.’*

So far was I. Penington from feeling any difficulty in acknowledging an unreserved belief of the truth of the Scripture miracles, that in the piece before us, although the subject did not necessarily call for or require such an acknowledgment, he expresses his belief of the miracles that were wrought to confirm the divine mission of Moses, and of those that were afterwards wrought by the holy prophets and apostles, as well as of those performed by Christ himself. In the answer the italic as usual distinguishes what is withheld from his readers by Verax : the whole of the question is omitted by him.

* Penington’s Works, Quarto Edit. Vol. II. p. 348, 349, 350.

Penington, in his answer, very justly represents the impropriety of expecting miracles now as an evidence of a minister of Christ being called by the Holy Spirit to preach the gospel; and unless it can be made to appear that any such evidence was ever required of H. Barnard, this part of Penington's answer is quite wide from the point before us. Again, the preference given by Penington to the evidence of the Spirit before that of miracles, considering them separate and distinct from each other, does not in the least invalidate the Scripture miracles. That miracles may leave a doubt on the mind that inquisitively asketh for a sign, is quite conformable to the effect, those wrought by our Saviour produced upon the minds of some of the Jews, as it is represented in the gospels, and can therefore be no proof of a doubt or disbelief of the truth of the evangelical accounts, to which Penington, in this very place refers the reader, as confirming the truth of what he advances: this latter part of his answer is consequently equally wide with the former, from the point strictly before us, which is, whether our first friends refused, as H. B. has done, to acknowledge their belief of the miracles of Christ.

The sentiments of I. Penington were such, no doubt, 'as the Society at that time approved,' and such as the Society at this time would think 'might be safely tolerated, even in an approved minister, without prejudice to the unity of the spirit which is the bond of peace.*' But 'the plain inference' of Verax that the proceedings against H. B. 'are a departure from the practice and principles of our predecessors in the faith,' he has not yet made appear to be deducible from his premises.

Before I finally take my leave of Penington, I will present the reader with his sentiments with regard to the Scriptures collectively.—The following is from a paper entitled, 'Concerning the Rule of the New Covenant,' &c.

'If a man receive the Spirit, and walk in the newness of the light and quickenings thereof every day, hath he not a rule which is certain and infallible? If any man be in Christ, there is a new creation; and the limits of that new creation (which is the light and power of the endless life, or of God's Holy Spirit dwelling within) are his rule. And within the bounds of that—man never errs; but out of it, deceit, and darkness, and error, is always at hand.'

'Yet (though we do own Christ to be the rule) we do not deny making use of the Scriptures to try doctrines by—but know that what is of God, doth and will agree therewith; and what doth not agree therewith is not of God; and that our

‘ forefathers in the faith were led to batter the fuperftitions and idolatries of the Papifts, by the testimony of the Scriptures. And we have alfo the testimony of the Scriptures with us, both to the light and Spirit within, and againft forms formerly invented, or now practifed, out of the life and power.*

On another occafion he fays, ‘ Chrift is the way, the truth, and the life.” What is a Chriftian’s rule? Is not the way of God his rule? Is not God’s truth his rule? And is not truth in Jefus; where it is taught and to be heard, and to be received even as it is in Jefus? Is not he the King, the Priest, the Prophet,—the way to God, the life itfelf, the living path out of death; yea, All in All to the believer, whose eye is opened to behold him? The Scriptures testify of Chrift, but they are not Chrift; they alfo testify of truth, and are a true testimony; but the truth itfelf is in Jefus, who by his living Spirit writes it in the heart which he hath made living.†

In another place on the Scriptures he remarks, ‘ The Scriptures are words, whose chief end, drift, and fervice is, to bring men to the Word from which the Scriptures came. And when men are there, then they are in the life of the Scriptures, and witnefs the fulfilling of the Scriptures, &c.‡

What has been before faid on the fubject of our firft friends’ belief of the Scriptures, precludes the neceffity of much comment on thefe paffages from our ancient and honourable elder. There is however one obfervation that prefents itfelf, namely, I. Penington fays the Scriptures *testify of truth, and are a true testimony*, that they are to try doctrines by, and ‘ that what is of God, doth and will agree therewith.’ H. Barnard would not confent to have her doctrines ‘ tried by the Scriptures confidered as a true record.’ I fhall leave the reader to make his own comment, after referring him to pages 105 and 106 of this work; and pafs on to the next author brought forward on this occafion.

The extracts by Verax from William Penn in this part of the Appeal are taken from his *Address to Protestants*, the purport of which work I have already fo fully investigated, that it will fuffice to refer the reader back to Chap. vi. page 143 to 150.

There is a paffage from Penn’s ‘ Serious Apology for the Principles and Practices of the People called Quakers,’ relating to the fubject of miracles, cited by Verax in his *Vindication*, and which he fays ‘ was approved and defended—as being “entirely rational,” by Jofeph Belfe, a friend of unquestioned orthodoxy, and high eftimation in our Society,’§ I fhall therefore prefent the reader with this paffage, and the defence of it by Jofeph Belfe, as it is given by the latter in his *Confutation of*

* Penington’s Works, Vol. II. p. 452.

† Ibid. Vol. I. p. 267. ‡ Ibid. p. 692. § Vindication, p. 118.

the charge of Deism, &c. in which work the writings of W. Penn 'are cleared from the perversions and misconstructions of a 'nameless author, in his late Vindication of the Bishop of 'Litchfield and Coventry.'

' Vin. page 49. " W. Penn (in his *Serious Apology*, &c. page " 38, 39. Vol. II. of his Works, Lond. 1726) speaks thus concerning Jesus's Miracles: But how weak an argument the " doctrine of miracles is, to prove the verity of the Christian " faith, or doctrine of revelation, at this time of day, is best seen " by considering it was weakness that occasioned them: for had " not the Lord Jesus observed the darkness and carnality of " those times to be so great, as without reaching through the " black clouds of their traditions and superstitions, by the hand " of his miracles (or visible signs to their understandings, or rather senses) there was no likelihood of fastening a conviction " on them, there never had been need of an external miracle in " any such sense. I would that the man [his opponent T. " Jenner] should know, we have received and maintained our " faith in Christ by more noble and sublime arguments, than " that of miracles; namely the truth, reason, equity, holiness, " and recompense of the Christian religion; which miracles can " never render more or less intrinsically so. Not that we put " a low esteem upon miracles, but *comparatively only*: and to say " they are ceased, is in no other sense true, than that wherein " vision or revelation is; I mean they are ceased to them that " have not faith. For many have, and do know, the power of " taking up their sick-beds, and walking; their faith in God's " power has made them whole."

' This adversary (Jenner)' adds J. Bessé, ' against whom W. ' P. was then disputing, had asserted that *the only sign and evidence of inspiration was miracles*; which assertion W. P. refutes, ' by showing him, that many, nay most, of the prophets are not ' recorded to have wrought any, and that it doth not appear ' that several of the writers of the Holy Scriptures ever wrought ' so much as one miracle. Whence he infers, that the *only proof* ' of their *writings being divinely inspired* could not be *miracles*, ' an inference entirely rational; as is the paragraph before cited, ' which imports no more, than that the truth, reason, equity, ' holiness, and recompense of the Christian religion, are more ' noble arguments to ground the belief of it upon, than the history of miracles wrought seventeen hundred years ago in confirmation of it. Will this defender of the Bishop assert the ' contrary? If so, he will give reasonable cause to suspect, that ' he puts as low an esteem upon the truth, reason, equity, holiness, and recompense of the Christian religion, as he now ' pretends W. P. does on miracles.*

Does W. Penn by giving a preference to the internal evidences in favour of Christianity, invalidate or depreciate the external evidences by which its truth is also confirmed? He says himself that he does not wish to put a low esteem on miracles but comparatively only, that is, he did not consider their evidence in favour of Christianity equally conclusive with the evidence afforded to the mind by the intrinsic excellence, purity, and holiness of the gospel as represented to it by the inspiration of the Spirit of God.

That he considered a belief of the miracles of Christ 'as an indispensable condition of religious fellowship,' appears from his making a belief of them a part of his *Christian Creed*, in which creed he has not included the peculiar tenets of the Friends, but only what he considered essential to constitute an outward profession of the Christian faith.

A particular investigation of the extracts adduced by Verax from R. Barclay on the subject of miracles, will not be necessary, since I have, in the letter to John Evans, (see page 10 to 16) noticed his extracts from Barclay's Letter to Adrian Paets, upon which he seems to have placed his principal dependence, as upon an impregnable fortress: whether I have succeeded in my attempt to dispossess him of this post must be left to the decision of the reader.

That R. Barclay did not intend, by the distinction he makes in the 13th Section of the 2d Proposition of his Apology, between the thesis and the hypothesis, to lessen or depreciate the outward evidence afforded to the truth of the gospel by the miracles of Christ is incontrovertibly evident from what he says in Prop. 5 and 6. § 15, of the same work, on the importance of a belief of the miracles of Christ.

The second Proposition treats *Of immediate revelation*; Barclay in the thirteenth section answers one of the objections usually made against the experience of it by Christians *now*.

'§ 13. The most usual is, that *these revelations are uncertain*.'

'But this bespeaketh much ignorance in the opposers; for we distinguish between the *thesis* and the *hypothesis*, that is, the *proposition* and *supposition*. For it is one thing to affirm, that the true and undoubted revelation of God's Spirit is certain and infallible; and another thing to affirm, that this or that particular person or people, is led infallibly by this revelation in what they speak or write, because they affirm themselves to be so led by the inward and immediate revelation of the Spirit. The first is only asserted by us, the latter may be called in question. The question is not, who are or are not so led? But whether all ought not or may not be so led?'

These remarks of Barclay's were no doubt intended to distinguish between those of his age who pretended to be led and

guided by the Spirit of God, and those who were really led and guided by it, and a very proper and just distinction it certainly is. But hence to infer that he even remotely intended to weaken the evidence we have for the reality of the miracles of Christ, the accounts of which we receive through the medium of inspired penmen, is ridiculous and absurd, since he affirms that if the Spirit be not resisted it will incline every one to 'believe all those things to have been certainly transacted, which are recorded in the Holy Scriptures' concerning Christ.

The sentiments of W. Penn and R. Barclay with regard to the importance that attaches to a belief of the miracles of Christ and his apostles, cannot be more suitably confirmed and illustrated than by the judicious reflections of Alexander Arscott, in his work entitled, *Some considerations relating to the present state of the Christian Religion*. What makes A. Arscott peculiarly proper to bring up the rear of my evidence in favour of the importance of believing the miracles of Christ, is that he has expressed his belief of the superiority of the internal to the external evidences of Christianity, and has with much perspicuity pointed out the importance of each.

'The prophecies of the Old Testament, and the miracles of our Lord and his apostles recorded in the New,' are what A. Arscott represents as the external evidences of the Christian religion, upon which he makes one or two short observations, before he proceeds to an investigation of the internal evidence of Christianity; to impress the importance of this last on the mind of his reader being the main design of his book.

The miracles of Christ being the subject that is now immediately under our consideration I shall confine myself to A. Arscott's sentiments relative to them.

'The miracles of our Lord and his apostles,' says this ingenious writer, 'were good helps ordained of God, for the introducing the belief of the Christian religion into the world; and it appears that they were often made instrumental to that end; though not always alike successful. For as it was in the case of the Scriptures, so it was in the case of miracles, they were more or less successful as they met with a better or worse disposition of mind, in those who were witnesses of them. Though this may be observed in general of them that opposed the miracles of our Lord and his apostles, that none of them denied the reality of the facts (as some of late have done), but endeavoured under various pretences, to frustrate the influence of them on the minds of the people, for their reception of the doctrine of the gospel. Some, which were the worst of all, attributed the miracles of our Lord to a diabolical power, saying, "He casteth out devils by Beelzebub, the Prince of devils." These not only received no benefit by them, but

‘ met with a most severe rebuke from our Lord himself ; which
 ‘ ought to be matter of caution and warning to those who endea-
 ‘ vour to make void the truth and reality of the miracles of
 ‘ Christ, or any other facts, which have the evidence of a divine
 ‘ power attending them ; as well as to those who countenance or
 ‘ encourage such an attempt.’*

After enumerating the different effects, the miracles of our Lord produced on the minds of those who were witnesses to them, A. Arscott concludes his remarks with the following excellent observations :

‘ From all which I draw this general conclusion, that miracles
 ‘ were a means in the hand of God, not only of convincing men
 ‘ of the truth of our Lord’s divine mission, &c. but of convert-
 ‘ ing those who duly regarded the divine power by which they
 ‘ were wrought, unto the true faith of the gospel, by which
 ‘ their hearts were purified, and all the good fruits and effects
 ‘ agreeable were brought forth ; of which miracles were often
 ‘ the remote cause, by raising the attention, and begetting a
 ‘ favourable reception of the doctrines and precepts delivered by
 ‘ him that was endued with that power. But the principal and
 ‘ immediate cause which rendered these and all other external
 ‘ means effectual, for the right receiving and believing the truths
 ‘ of the gospel, was the Spirit of God opening the understand-
 ‘ ing, and working a right disposition of mind for these ends.
 ‘ And this was the reason of the different effects of miracles on
 ‘ those who were witnesses of them ; some only regarding the
 ‘ miracles themselves as outward acts ; and the effect as to these
 ‘ was no more, but to beget an admiration of them, as of some-
 ‘ thing extraordinary ; and their attention terminating there,
 ‘ they received no real profit or benefit by them. Others, be-
 ‘ lieving a divine power attended them who wrought those
 ‘ mighty works, and therefore giving credit to the doctrines
 ‘ delivered by them, the good Spirit of God disposing them
 ‘ thereto, were really converted unto the faith through that occa-
 ‘ sion. Thus miracles, as outward acts, had a relation to inward
 ‘ and spiritual effects, and so far may have a spiritual application ;
 ‘ but from thence to represent them as only true in a spiritual
 ‘ or allegorical sense, as some of late have done, is manifestly
 ‘ contrary to the nature and design of them, which was to rouse
 ‘ the attention to things spiritual ; and inconsistent with the
 ‘ accounts we have of them in the Holy Scriptures, and tends to
 ‘ make void the good ends of the gospel, which depends on the
 ‘ truth and reality of the whole, as related by the evangelists
 ‘ and sacred writers, more especially that greatest of all miracles,
 ‘ *the resurrection of our Lord from the dead* ; whereby a substantial

‘ foundation of faith in God, through Jesus Christ, was laid ;
 ‘ and therefore to endeavour to make void the truth and reality
 ‘ of it, is to make void the faith of the gospel itself, according
 ‘ to the express words of the apostle, 1 Cor. xv. “ If Christ be
 “ not risen, our preaching is vain, and your faith is also vain ;
 “ ye are yet in your sins.”*’

Little need be said to apply these observations to H. B. for if she did not directly and openly deny the truth and reality of the miracles of Christ, her answers to the committees evinced, at least, that she was far from believing them. Of the resurrection of Christ, upon which Arscott lays such important stress, she clearly avowed her disbelief. What her views of the faith of the gospel are, it is difficult to ascertain with certainty ; that they are very different from those of the first Friends, I think the reader will be convinced by the preceding pages, and for a further confirmation of it I shall extract a passage from some *Remarks upon a Summary of H. B.’s Faith*, which was written by herself, and distributed in manuscript among the Friends.

‘ She writes as follows, “ This system of jargon, [the doctrine
 “ of the atonement through the death of Christ] which scarcely
 “ admits of a parallel, appears irreconcilable in my judgment
 “ to the general attributes of the Divinity, which my under-
 “ standing—early revolted at ; and which, to me, changes in
 “ nothing but increasing absurdity, and visible traces of priest-
 “ craft and ignorant credulity, almost at every repeated investi-
 “ gation. And what is beyond extraordinary, we are told, that
 “ these unaccountable transactions took place ages before any
 “ of us, that are now on the stage of action, had any conscious
 “ existence.” ‘ In the above paragraph may be discovered visible
 ‘ traces of that—inconsistency, that almost always attends the op-
 ‘ posers of Christianity ; for without entering into the merits of
 ‘ the system of jargon she speaks of, it may be asked, from
 ‘ whence have we the relation of these unaccountable transac-
 ‘ tions ? Is it not from the four evangelists, from whom we
 ‘ have the account of the miraculous conception, birth, miracles,
 ‘ sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ ? whose accounts
 ‘ are here by her attributed to priestcraft and ignorant credulity,
 ‘ and the authors placed among her bewildered fabricators.
 ‘ From what record she has discovered the plain, wise, and clear
 ‘ consistency of the doctrines of Christ, and from whence she
 ‘ has derived her belief in the dispensation of the gospel, is best
 ‘ known to herself ; speaking of which, she says, she believes it
 “ to be the most perfect dispensation ever ministered to man in
 “ its kind ; that is an outward or secondary testimony of the
 “ will of God to us.” ‘ Now the dispensation of the gospel, as

‘believed in by Friends, is of an inward nature, even a dispensation of the Spirit, which we have obtained through the coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; for of his fulness have we all received, and grace for grace; and the Scripture speaking of the dispensation of the gospel, says, “For by one offering, he (that is Christ) hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified, whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us, for after that he had said before, This is the covenant that I will make with them after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my laws into their hearts, and in their minds will I write them:—having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, &c.”*

H. B. in her *Vindication*, which was designed for an answer to the *Remarks* upon her Summary, has passed by this paragraph without animadversion; hence we may conclude that her sentiments are not mis-stated therein: perhaps to notice it would not have consisted with that reserve and concealment as to the extent of her doubts or disbelief, which, when that paper was written, she thought it most expedient to practise. I say when it was written, because since the decision of her case by the yearly meeting of London, she has been less reserved in manifesting a disbelief of the truth of the sacred records. We may at least form this conclusion from what we learn in the *Sequel* to the *Appeal*; for according to that work, she circulated among her friends, after her return to America, Evanston’s work, entitled, ‘The Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists,’ &c. The title of which is sufficiently descriptive of its contents to bespeak the complexion of a person who could give it circulation.

The unfair statement of transactions in the *Appeal* does not afford much encouragement to expect that a greater degree of candour has been exercised in the narrative contained in the *Sequel*, of which we do not however possess sufficient information to investigate its accuracy; neither is it necessary, since it is sufficiently correct for my present purpose: for we may conclude that H. B. would be rather inclined to extenuate, than to exaggerate her disbelief of the sacred oracles.

The conversation which is related to have passed between H. Barnard and the American committee, from page 54 to 56 of the *Sequel*, and which Verax must have obtained from her, whether justly given or not, evinces her approbation of the de-

* Some Tracts relating to the Controversy between H. B. and the Society of Friends, p. 11, 12.

sign and purport of Evanfon's book. She says indeed that she does not join with all the author's sentiments. This we may easily credit, when we consider that the author is so far from entertaining any doubt of the reality of the resurrection of Christ's body from the grave, and his appearances to his disciples after his resurrection as they are recorded by Luke, that he represents Christ's resurrection from the grave to have been that which constituted him the Son of God, in opposition to chap. i. ver. 35 of Luke, which attributes this appellation to his birth; the account of which, together with all the *peculiar* fundamental doctrines of the gospel, are rejected by this dashing writer.

H. Barnard says that she believes this writer no more intended, than R. Barclay did in his *Apology*, to invalidate by what he had published, the essential parts or doctrines contained in the Scriptures; therefore those parts of the New Testament which it is the design of the book, and the obvious intention of the author, to reject 'as spurious fictions of the second century, unnecessary and even prejudicial to the cause of true Christianity, and in every respect unworthy of the regard which so many ages have paid to them;'* cannot be viewed by her as essential parts of Scripture, or that the Christian religion can derive any material injury by the rejection of them. In this point of view she must therefore consider the Gospels of St. Matthew, Mark, and John; and of the Gospel of St. Luke the two first chapters,—the transfiguration of Jesus,—the promise to the thief on the cross, &c. also the apostolical epistles 'to the Romans—to the Ephesians—to the Colossians—to the Hebrews—of James—of Peter—of John—of Jude—and in the book of the Revelation, the Epistles to the seven churches of Asia;† the authenticity of which this champion of Socinianism, Evanfon, has endeavoured to crush with a single blow; but happily for the cause of truth, his weapon falls powerless to the ground. It does not comport with my present design to investigate his arguments further than has been already done in answer to Verax from page 207 to 232 of this work. Suffice it to say, that if arrogance, self-conceit, assumption without proof, ridicule, and a want of gravity in treating of sacred subjects, form the proper armour for the Socinian combatant, it must be acknowledged that Evanfon is armed in panoply.

H. Barnard's persisting in the circulation of the sentiments just enumerated, through the medium of Evanfon's book, and works of a similar nature, appears to have been the immediate cause of her being disowned as a member of the Society of Friends by the monthly meeting of Hudson, in the State of New-York, North America. That any possible advantage could have

* Evanfon's *Dissonance*, p. 255.

† *Ibid.* p. 256.

resulted either to herself or the Society of Friends, by her continuing in outward communion with it, whilst she conceived it to be her duty to overturn its fundamental principles, as gross and fraudulent corruptions of Christianity, is too paradoxical for me to attempt to explain.

How Verax has obtained the sense of the Society on the conclusion come to by the friends in America, I know not; but the act of disownment, when properly considered in connexion with the principles and conduct of H. Barnard, must, I am satisfied, notwithstanding his assertion to the contrary, meet not only with *the approbation of the most zealous disciplinarians on this side the Atlantic*, but also *of the Society at large*.

I have assigned a reason for declining an investigation of the particular steps taken by the monthly meeting of Hudson in H. B.'s case antecedent to its disownment of her. If a narrative of the proceedings of the Friends in America, in the case of H. B. had been published on the other side of the Atlantic, it would have been much more likely to meet with a suitable reply, than in England, so remote from the source of information.

For an account of the more public proceedings in England, in the case of H. B. to most of which I could speak as an eye-witness, see the letter to John Evans, p. 17 to 24. Her examination before the several committees, I am not qualified to speak to from personal knowledge; and since all the information the public could receive of what passed in them, must be obtained from the parties immediately interested, I have preferred, and particularly at this distance of time, to reply more directly to those parts of the *Appeal*, &c. that do not altogether depend upon either the committees or H. B. for information: still I have occasionally taken the advantage of some minutes made at the time, with which I have been supplied by a member of the morning meeting's committee; whenever they assisted in throwing additional light on her opinions. Some errors relative to some false representations of the sentiments of R. Barclay by H. Barnard before the committees, are also noticed in the course of this work. To these I shall add a few remarks on the review of the proceedings in England, given in the *Sequel* to the *Appeal*.

The *Appeal* contains reflections on the Society for having departed from the plainest principles of equity, justice, and gospel order, through the omission of previously extending private admonition towards Hannah Barnard. In my letter to John Evans, written in 1802, I refuted this accusation against the Society, observing that private advice was certainly given to her, prior to any charge being presented against her in the select

yearly meeting of 1800. In the *Sequel* which was published in 1804, we are informed that a conversation had taken place, a few weeks before the select yearly meeting in Ireland in the same year (1800), between H. B. and another person at Carlow, at which Joseph Williams was present, but who was wholly silent at the succeeding select yearly meeting held in Dublin, respecting the opinions H. B. had expressed at the above conversation; 'yet,' continues Verax, 'about two weeks afterwards, *on that ground, and on that ground only*, did he formally accuse Hannah Barnard, before the yearly meeting of ministers and elders in London, of holding erroneous opinions concerning war.*

Upon reading the above paragraph in the *Sequel*, I was struck with, but under no difficulty to account for, the emphasis laid upon the words, *on that ground, and on that ground only*, which seem to imply that the author had seen a contrary position; for although no answer to the second and third parts of the *Appeal* had appeared in print, yet I had reason strongly to suspect, (from a circumstance† that had transpired some time before), that the author of the *Sequel* was not unacquainted with the contents of my letter to John Evans, and that he therefore wished to anticipate an objection that might otherwise be made in print.

But anxious as Verax is not to lose the opportunity, a supposed deficiency of private advice gave him for severe reflections on the conduct of the Society, he seems to have discovered afterwards that his ground was not tenable; for in a note in page 65 of the *Sequel*, he informs us, 'I have, however, been recently informed, that he [Joseph Williams] previously [to the select yearly meeting of Ireland], communicated his uneasiness to Hannah Barnard, respecting the sentiments which she expressed in the conversation at Carlow, on the subject of war: and therefore, although he was not supported by the select

* *Sequel*, p. 5.

† The circumstance to which I allude, I shall simply relate, and leave the reader to judge whether my conjectures are without foundation. An intimate friend of mine, not a member of our Society, had written a letter to John Evans, complaining of the 'cruel censure' implied in his note 'on the measures of the Society with regard to' H. B. This letter was sent to J. E. about two or three months before mine. I had, in confidence, informed my friend of my intention to write to J. E. which induced him also confidentially to show me a copy of the letter which he had a little before sent to him. After this, the reader may easily guess my surprise, upon discovering accidentally in some company (soon after its delivery), that H. B.'s party were not only acquainted with J. E.'s having received such a letter, but also with the contents of it.

‘ yearly meeting in Dublin, in the objections he offered, in general terms, to the full approbation which the certificate [given to H. B.] expressed, as his dissatisfaction continued, he might be justifiable, in afterwards explaining those objections more fully in the select yearly meeting in London. And the reader is therefore requested to qualify the censure bestowed, or implied, with regard to his conduct, in pages 44 and 45 of the *Appeal*, or in page 5 of this *Narrative*, as far as he conceives these circumstances may require.’

The acknowledgment of error by an author, when he discovers it, is certainly commendable. But whence comes it that he is only so recently informed of so important a circumstance, since H. B. could not have been ignorant of the private admonition she had received before any public exposure? To what principle are we to attribute the suppression of a fact, the knowledge of which is so essential to forming a correct idea of the propriety of the measures afterwards pursued? What credit is to be given to such *ex parte* evidence which can suppress so important a fact to serve its own purpose? There is likewise an inconsistency and incongruity in the assertions of Verax, that would invalidate his evidence in any court of justice; for after having in the note of p. 65 exculpated Joseph Williams from any censure for presenting an accusation against H. B. to the yearly meeting at London, in consideration of his having extended previous private advice, Verax in page 81 animadverting on the testimony of denial issued by the monthly meeting of Hudson against H. B. says,—

‘ Hannah Barnard is next said to have “had abundant labours bestowed upon her, *in a private way*, as well as by “divers meetings in Great Britain.” How was the meeting informed that any private labour was extended to her on this side the Atlantic? the documents of accusation from hence give no such information. The meeting must therefore have presumed, that private admonition according to gospel order, preceded the exposure of her errors; or, must have hazarded this assertion on *private information*. Whether the meeting was misled in this instance, by giving ear to erroneous intelligence, or inadvertently stated as a matter of fact, an inference of its own, is not for me to decide. But it is undeniable that Hannah Barnard was publicly accused, *in the first instance*, before the associated body of ministers and elders, for Great Britain and Ireland, in violation of the rules of our discipline. After which public exposure of the case, the extension of private labour, in the usual acceptation of the term, was impracticable.’

From what official document has this writer derived his undeniable information, to induce him thus twice flatly to

contradict himself in the course of the same work? How are we to know that private labour had been extended to H. B. but by private information either from herself, or from the individuals that had privately visited her? and is not the veracity of these last as much to be depended on as that of H. B? I have been informed by a friend of London, that (besides the private advice extended towards her in Ireland, the truth of which, Verax with all his reluctance, is obliged to admit) he, in company with Joseph Williams, privately called on her in England, previously to her being publicly accused in the select yearly meeting, and I must confess myself quite at a loss to discover how Joseph Williams was herein guilty of any 'violation of the rules of our discipline.' Perhaps, hereafter, Verax may give us more information on this subject, by explaining the cause of the palpable contradiction contained in his Narrative.

Verax also, in his *Sequel* to the Appeal, accuses the morning meeting of having exercised 'a dangerous and unprecedented power,' with which it was not 'constitutionally invested,' and that in violation of the 'express rules of the Society, the morning meeting not only ventured to pronounce a sentence against Hannah Barnard, equivalent to disowning her as a minister, both here and in her native land; but presented her as a delinquent, to a meeting for discipline.*

The principal force of these censures turns upon a misconstruction of the yearly meeting minute of 1735, and of the conduct of the morning meeting. Desiring the reader first to turn back to page 18 and 19, and read my extract from, and remarks upon the rule of 1735, I shall proceed to observe, that the conduct of the morning meeting was in perfect accordance with this rule, for when its *advice* had been slighted and rejected by H. B. knowing that to be the extent of its authority, it very properly referred the further care of her case to a monthly meeting of discipline, and stopped all further proceedings, as enjoined by this rule, which says that on notice from a 'monthly meeting, that they have taken the case under their care, all proceedings of the morning or other meeting of ministers against such minister or elder shall be finally stopped,' and it also hereby acted agreeably to the rule of the yearly meeting, which enjoins, 'that such meeting do not in any wise take upon it, or interfere with, any part of the discipline of the church, belonging either to this meeting, or any subordinate meeting.†

Verax asserts that the morning meeting pronounced a sentence against H. Barnard equivalent to disowning her† as a mi-

* *Sequel*, p. 7.

† Book of Extracts, 2d Edit. p. 102.

‡ Instead of disowning, *silencing* would, in this place; have been

nister, both here and in her native land. What is here denominated a sentence equivalent to disownment, is expressed in these words :

‘ Wherefore this meeting (conformable to the verbal advice given by the yearly meeting of ministers and elders, in case she should continue in her dissent), recommends the said Hannah Barnard to desist from travelling, or speaking, as a minister of our religious Society; but that she quietly return, by the first convenient opportunity, to her own habitation.’

This *recommendation* is no doubt expressive of the morning meeting’s disapprobation of H. B.’s ministry; but it, at the same time, carefully avoided going beyond the extent of its powers, which are merely to advise, rebuke, and exhort: for it did not enforce its own advice, but left that for a monthly meeting to do, provided it approved of the recommendation given to H. B. And when this recommendation met the approbation, and was confirmed by the united judgment, of the respective monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, before which the consideration of her case came; although it would have been highly indecorous for her to have attempted to preach, or travel, as a minister, within the limits or jurisdiction of a yearly meeting, which, by her persevering opposition to the advice of her friends, had been impelled thus publicly to testify its disunity with her ministry: yet nothing that was done by any of the meetings in England, regularly removed her from the station of a minister of the Society in America. This could only be done by the meetings of discipline in her own land, of which she then was a regular member, and acknowledged minister. Hence the propriety of Devonshire House monthly meeting’s sending a copy of its proceedings in her case to the monthly meeting of Hudson, in the State of New-York, for them to be either confirmed or rejected by it. So that none of the meetings in England either could or did entirely silence her as a minister, much less *disown* her as a member of the Society of Friends; consequently none of them went to that extent of power in their proceedings, prohibited to the morning meeting by the concluding paragraph of the rule of 1735, viz. ‘ Neither the morning meeting, nor any other meeting of ministers, have power to disown any minister, or other person, in any capacity whatsoever, this solely belonging to the monthly, quarterly, half-yearly, or yearly meetings.’ That is, in whatever station or capacity a person may be, whether minister, elder, overseer, or otherwise, no meeting of ministers and elders has a right to disown him or her as a member.

been more strictly correct; she was not disowned till after her return to America.

With a view of impressing the reader with the impropriety of the morning meeting's presenting H. B. 'as a delinquent, to a 'meeting for discipline,' it is represented both in the *Appeal* and *Sequel* that the monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, were biassed or fettered in their proceedings and final judgment, by the powerful influence of the meeting, in which the accusation originated; but from the narrative of these proceedings, as it is even given by Verax, it is difficult to trace any marks of this improper bias; for example, when the monthly meeting of Devonshire House received the minute of the morning meeting, referring H. B.'s case to its care, so far was it from being influenced by the weight and respectability of the body by whom it was presented, that it hesitated on the propriety of taking up the subject at all, until informed that 'it was the wish of the party 'accused that they should act upon it,' whereon a minute was made, appointing three friends to visit H. B. who were neither in the station of ministers nor elders; and therefore not members of the morning meeting.*

This conduct of the meeting, when considered in connexion with Verax's representation of the powerful influence of the accusing body, may, at first sight, appear rather singular to the reader; but his surprise will cease when he recollects† that the party accused had in her possession certificates from the monthly and quarterly meetings of discipline, and the yearly meeting of ministers and elders in America, to which she belonged, expressive of their unity with her as a minister, and also with her engagement to visit Friends in Great Britain and Ireland. The influence of these certificates being sufficient to counteract the supposed influence of the minute from the morning meeting.

The monthly meeting was obliged in its minute of judgment to revert to the recommendation of the morning meeting; since the design of the minute was either to confirm, or to reject as improper, the advice of that meeting; and the report of the committee it had appointed to visit H. B. a copy of which was a little before delivered to her, is sufficiently descriptive of her sentiments to authorize its final judgment; without having recourse to any 'undue influence of the accusing body.'

Speaking of the influence exerted by some members of the select meeting in the quarterly meeting, Verax says, 'This 'influence, however, did not procure the appointment of any 'member of the morning meeting thereon [the committee to 'hear, and judge of H. B.'s Appeal], although the eligibility of 'such persons was warmly urged by several of its members. 'For the meeting not only deemed such persons ineligible, but 'also several other friends, who had publicly taken an active

‘part against the appellant, when her case was before the
‘monthly meeting.’*

By *several other friends*, in this paragraph, are to be understood friends who were neither members of the select meeting, nor of the monthly meeting, but some who might have been accidentally at the monthly meeting when H. B.’s case was considered in it. If the members of the select meeting were really united in exerting an improper influence in the quarterly meeting (which is certainly implied in this passage, and a similar one in the Appeal), nothing could more convincingly prove that the meeting resisted every such attempt, than the above paragraph; but I believe no such system of influence was pursued by the members of the select meeting, and that we should find some of them were for, as well as some against, the exclusion of any minister or elder from the quarterly meeting’s committee. It is worthy of remark that Verax, when describing the appointment of this committee, says that ‘the quarterly meeting appeared to ‘be generally impressed with the extreme impropriety’ of the measure proposed by ‘several leading members of the select ‘meeting.’† And yet if we are to credit him, those very members, with the extreme impropriety of whose conduct the quarterly meeting was so generally impressed, were able afterwards to assume such vast importance, and uncontrolled authority, as to be the sole cause that the report brought in by the committee, was confirmed; they being ‘seated as her judges, claiming ‘and exercising their full and accustomed portion of influence ‘and control over the decision of the meeting:’‡ whilst the rest, that is by far the greater part of the quarterly meeting were only silent spectators, implicitly submitting to the decision of these unjust judges, whom they had but a little before opposed with so much firmness and unanimity. The extravagance and inconsistency of these assertions form their own refutation.

If the reader turn back to page 20, he will see, from thence to page 23, an account of the proceedings of the yearly meeting on the appeal presented to it by H. B. against the judgment of the quarterly meeting, and that they were ‘consonant to the existing regulation of the yearly meeting, that “no representative “of any quarterly meeting, from which, or against which, an “appeal may come, shall be nominated on this committee [of “Appeals],”§ notwithstanding the insinuation contained in the *Sequel* to the contrary.

The objection made in the yearly meeting on behalf of the appellant, against the eligibility of some of the committee on

* Sequel, p. 13.

† Appeal, p. 126.

‡ Sequel, p. 14.

§ Sequel, p. 17. Book of Extracts, 2d Edit. p. 3.

appeals, on account of their stations in the Society, was not sufficiently specific to be so far admitted by the yearly meeting, as to induce it to reverse its appointment regularly made, conformably to its own rules; since it did not hence follow that they had ever expressed their sentiments before on the case committed to them. But in consequence of the appellant's expressing her dissatisfaction when the committee reported its judgment to the meeting, she was afterwards permitted to defend her appeal against the objections of the respondent, before the meeting itself; and *no minister nor elder was allowed to have a voice in the final judgment of the meeting.* This last circumstance, which forms so very important a part of the proceedings of the yearly meeting in this case, is not once adverted to, either in the *Appeal* or *Sequel*!

Besides these inaccuracies and omissions, several more might be mentioned, one or two of which only I shall point out; for example, the assertion that it is 'the *invar.able* practice' of the yearly meeting 'to have appeals read, previous to the report of 'a committee thereon,' I believe, upon examination, Verax will discover to be incorrect; from private minutes made at the time, it appears that John Gurney, at the yearly meeting before which H. B.'s appeal came, made a distinct reference to a recent 'instance directly in point' in which the report of the committee was read *first*, previously to the appeal, and gave satisfaction to the appellant. So that the yearly meeting was not without precedent for reading the report of the committee before the appeal, in the case of H. Barnard. Again, the speech of J. G. Bevan, in the yearly meeting, in reply to Hannah Barnard, and what immediately followed, as given by Verax, manifest, to speak most favourably, such deficiency in his recollection of what passed in the public yearly meeting, that, even admitting his veracity, they prove his memory to be too treacherous to qualify him for a correct reporter of judicial proceedings; for J. G. Bevan, who spoke on behalf of the respondents, introduced into an early part of his speech what is inserted at the latter end of it in the *Appeal*, neither does it appear that he was assisted by his colleagues during his speech: but immediately on his sitting down, the clerk turned to H. Barnard, and asked her, if she had any thing further to offer, to which, after a short silence, she replied, No. J. G. B. on being asked the same question, replied, he must request to withdraw with his colleagues, that they might consult; and on his return, he made that addition (of which one of them had reminded him), which is inserted in the body of his first speech, page 208 of the *Appeal*; to which *then* H. B. made some reply. From which it is evident that she had originally no intention to attempt a refutation of the respondent's speech, and that all she said arose from what J. G. B.

afterwards added in consequence of consulting with the other respondents. Her motives for acting in this manner are stated and animadverted on in page 23 of this work. H. Barnard's reply to the clerk of the meeting, and the other circumstances last mentioned, are entirely omitted in the Appeal.

The offer made by the meeting for sufferings to H. Barnard 'to provide her with suitable accommodations on her intended return to America, and to defray the expence of her passage,' is noticed in the *Sequel*. Why was this circumstance, so inconsistent with a spirit of bigotry, blind zeal, and intolerance, entirely omitted in the *Appeal*, which professes to delineate the spirit and conduct displayed by the Society towards H. B.? It must have been as much impressed on the memory of Verax then, as at the publication of the *Sequel* two years afterwards. Or rather, how came a transaction, so contrary in its tendency to the main design and scope of these publications, to gain admittance in a work written so long after the event, when it must have been *knowingly* omitted in one published at the time? I can account for this curious fact, no otherwise, than upon the supposition that Verax had either seen, or been informed of my remarks upon his omission of it in the *Appeal*, in the letter to J. Evans, and that he therefore threw it into the *Sequel*, merely to prevent any public animadversion on his omission of it; for even this late mention of it by him is not accompanied with any expression of satisfaction or approbation.

The reader has now before him all that I deem necessary to advance in reply to the various publications of Verax; and upon an impartial review of the doctrines of the Society of Friends, as promulgated by their worthy and honourable ancestors, who were distinguished for their persevering labours and sufferings in the cause of the gospel of Christ; and of the real nature and tendency of the opinions of H. Barnard adverted to in the charges exhibited against her; he will judge for himself, whether there were not sufficient reasons, in the discordance between her opinions, and those professed by the Society of Friends, fully to justify the conduct of the latter in silencing her as a minister of the gospel in unity with them, and disowning her as a member of their Society: also whether, upon a review of the conduct of the several meetings in England towards H. B. he can discover that they were influenced by any other than a tempered, Christian zeal, with firmness and moderation opposing the introduction and dissemination of tenets in the Society, which they considered to be subversive of the Christian faith. And that this is not an exaggerated view of the tendency of the opinions opposed in these pages, I think will be admitted, when it is considered that if the Bible be *not a true record*, and of di-

vine authority, we are left to wander in the devious mazes of scepticism and infidelity.

A few years have now elapsed since the final issue of Hannah Barnard's case; and time, which confirms or refutes the vaunts of the boaster, affords us an opportunity of calmly and dispassionately examining the effects that have resulted from her zealous opposition to the doctrine and discipline of the Friends, and whether they correspond with the sanguine expectations she appears to have cherished, by her remarks on the final judgment of the yearly meeting.

'I must,' says she, 'have been very inattentive, not to have discovered symptoms of ignorant zeal, and degeneracy, sufficient to impress a strong expectance of such a final issue. But as my motive was not a victory of so unimportant a kind, but the excitement of general inquiry amongst the rising generation, and others of independent minds, many of whom in this land, and especially in our Society, very evidently to me, needed something to awaken their attention, and call forth their faculties to real usefulness to themselves and others: so I have the consolation of seeing the good effects of my trying lot of labour, in a remarkable degree; for I believe scarce any thing of an instrumental nature would have given a greater moral electric shock, throughout our poor diminished Society,* as well as among others in this nation, that could have happened among us.†

If the labours of H. B. have ever operated as a moral electric shock on our Society, they can only have had the momentary effect produced by such shocks; for let us take a survey around us—What schism have they produced? What sensible impression does the Society in England at this moment feel from them? That there are individuals whose minds have been warped from the faith of the gospel by the labours of H. B. and her advocates, as also by means of the prevalence of a spirit of infidelity, I believe to be a lamentable truth; and through sincere desires for the restoration of these to the apostolic faith, and for the preservation of those who may not yet have fallen into the snare, have I felt myself engaged to use my feeble endeavours: and these endeavours I commit to the divine blessing.

Of the 'ignorant zeal and degeneracy' prevalent among some few who assume our name, the productions of the advocates of

* Exultation and contempt!!!

† Appeal, p. 227, 228.

H. B. give melancholy proof. And on this subject we may adopt the language of the meeting for sufferings in their preface to the Book of Extracts, as peculiarly adapted to the occasion.

‘Notwithstanding it is too obvious to be denied, that there are amongst us many sorrowful instances of a grievous departure from the godly zeal, purity, probity, simplicity, and self-denial, so conspicuous in our worthy predecessors; yet—it must be allowed that, as a religious body, we are the same people our forefathers were, in faith, in doctrine, in worship, in ministry, and in discipline.’

‘And although, it be our lot to live in an age of great dissipation, luxury, and profaneness, when the genuine fruits of the spirit of Christianity are so rarely seen, that every thing sacred and serious seems threatened to be overwhelmed by the torrent of vice and irreligion; yet we are bowed in thankfulness to the Author of all good, in that we have abundant cause to believe there are still many of various ranks and ages, mercifully preserved both among ourselves, and in other Christian communities, who, through faithfulness to the measure of grace which is given to every one to profit with, have been strengthened to retain their integrity, and to hold fast the profession of their faith without wavering. Many of them, doubtless, are at times secretly mourning over the great desolations which infidelity and immorality have made in the Christian world; nevertheless, they are comforted at seasons in the hope of better times, and helped to look forward with an eye of faith, and with unshaken confidence, to the gradual increase of that day, when darkness shall no longer cover the earth, nor gross darkness the hearts of the people, when the spiritual kingdom of Christ shall be exalted over all, and that glorious ancient prophecy fulfilled, when he shall have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession; when nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more; and when the saving knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth, as the waters cover the sea.’

F I N I S.

B O O K S

LATELY PUBLISHED BY

P H I L L I P S A N D F A R D O N,

An Examination of the first part of An Appeal to the Society of Friends, by Vindex. 1s.

Some Tracts relating to the Controversy between Hannah Barnard and the Society of Friends; wherein the primitive Christian Principles of the said Society are presented to the Public; by Christicola. 1s.

Thoughts on Reason and Revelation, particularly the Revelation of the Scriptures. By Joseph Gurney Bevan. Stitched. 6d.

The Principles of Religion, as professed by the Society of Christians usually called Quakers; written for the Instruction of their Youth, and for the Information of Strangers. By Henry Tuke. Price 2s 6d. bds. 3s bd. in Sheep; and 3s 6d in Calf and lettered.

An Apology for Silent Waiting upon God in Religious Assemblies; with some Observations on the Nature and Ground of True Faith, and the Application thereof in the important concern of Worship. By Thomas Colley. 6d.











